SEPTEMBER 1967

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 19

4

THE BLACK AND THE RED

THE EDITORS

CAPITAL AND IMPERIALISM

HORACE B. DAVIS

WHY THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION?

K. S. KAROL

Culture of Poverty GORDON K. LEWIS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME NINETEEN NUMBER FOUR SEPTEMBER 1967

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Black and the Red 1
TWO LETTERS TO THE TIMES 11
THE NEED FOR REVOLUTION by Floyd B. McKissick 12
CAPITAL AND IMPERIALISM: A LANDMARK IN MARXIST THEORY by Horace B. Davis 14
WHY THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION? by K. S. Karol 22
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 36
BOOKS: CULTURE OF POVERTY OR POVERTY OF CULTURE? by Gordon K. Lewis 44
END OF AN EPOCH IN THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM by Philip Reno 54

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright © 1967, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: USA: 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W.6., Telephone: Renown 8824.
Latin America: Editorial MR, Casilla 5437, Santiago, Chile.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $10; elsewhere $12.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Not since the publication of *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution* has an MR Press book received such widespread notice and acclaim as *Revolution in the Revolution?* by Régis Debray. The cloth book ($4.00) will be published on September 15, but the critic for the *New York Times,* in an unprecedented move, did not wait for publication day and reviewed the double issue of the *magazine* on July 26. And *Ramparts* burned up the telephone wires to arrange for three pages of excerpts of the book to appear in its September issue, along with an article on the author. Booming sales of the magazine on the newsstands and in bookstores reflect the fact that, as the *Times* commented editorially on June 27, the thesis propounded by Debray has been under "international discussion" since first publication abroad.

Another MR Press bestseller is Bertrand Russell's angry and eloquent book, *War Crimes in Vietnam,* still available in a paperback edition at 95¢. The clothbound book ($4.00) will be published on September 5.

The influential *Library Journal,* in its review of Gunder Frank's *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America,* says: ". . . If one shares Professor Frank's basic assumptions, the book is vital; if not, it is

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BLACK AND THE RED

We write shortly after the Detroit uprising of late July and with little information about that or other recent uprisings beyond what has appeared in the bourgeois press. The following observations are therefore subject to amendment and/or correction.

Up to a point the uprisings of 1967 appear to follow closely the pattern made familiar by their predecessors of the last three summers. The igniting spark is always an act of police repression, usually accompanied by brutality. Blacks, mostly young people among whom the unemployment rate is more than double that of whites, and has been so high for so long that many of them have never had a job—and never will—form into roving bands whose wrath is mainly vented against the property of white exploiters. Rocks, bottles, and gasoline bombs are the principal weapons during this stage. Next comes the "looting" stage (from the point of view of black morality what is involved is not reprehensible theft but justifiable expropriation), in which residents of all ages in the affected areas tend to join. One of the most notable innovations in the Detroit uprising is that apparently for the first time blacks and poor whites got together and helped each other in the looting stage.* By this time the forces of law and order (municipal police and firemen, state police, National Guard, and in Detroit, for the first time, federal troops) are mobilized and sent into action. Attempts to break up the youth bands and stop the looting produce extensive casualties and arrests, and these in turn give rise to growing resistance and counter-attack. In earlier uprisings it seems that the main weapons of the insurgents in this stage, as in the initial stage, were rocks, bottles, and other missiles. But in New-

*This has given rise to the suggestion that a new slogan, replacing a familiar one of an earlier period, should be: "Black and White, Unite and Light." As in the case of much wit, the form conceals a serious content.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ark and Detroit—and this is perhaps the chief distinguishing feature of these latest uprisings—an increasing role in this stage has been played by snipers, operating singly or in small groups.

The growing intervention of snipers tends to transform the character of the conflict. This is not because sniping as such is capable of inflicting major casualties on the forces of law and order—such is not the case—but because sniping on any considerable scale inevitably calls forth drastic counter-measures. In this connection a dispatch by Douglas Robinson from Newark in the *New York Times* of July 17th is highly instructive:

> Deep concern by some city and state officials over the effects of massive rather than selective firepower against rioters here is being voiced at strategy meetings between Gov. Richard J. Hughes and Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio.
>
> Those officials are increasingly alarmed by the growing tendency of lawmen and militia to throw up a "wall" of fire at buildings where suspected snipers are thought to be hiding. . . .
>
> Last night, the police, state troopers and National Guard men spattered hundreds of apartments in the ghetto with machine-gun, rifle and pistol fire. Many buildings had all their windows shot out during a search for snipers such as those who killed a fire captain and wounded a National Guard sergeant during the night.
>
> Many in the Negro community blame the state police and the militiamen for most of the firing. One city official who expressed doubts about the use of heavy firepower agreed with them.
>
> "The troopers and the guardsmen will go away when this is over," he said. "They don't care much if they break a lot of windows before they go."
>
> The official, who declined to be identified, said he feared that resentment and a desire for revenge would linger for years in the Negro districts and would create a climate where there would be almost no communication between Negro and white.
>
> He indicated that many ghetto residents would not really differentiate between state troopers and the city police. "They'll just remember that whitey shot up the town," he said. . . .
>
> In explaining that there was no disagreement on the overall use of force to contain the disorder, the city official declared that no one doubted that snipers could not be lured from their nests but had to be driven out by bullets.
>
> "There are just some of us who feel that it is not necessary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to riddle an entire building because there is a sniper on the roof," he said.

The experience of Detroit, however, seems to indicate that the "moderates" who would deal with snipers in a controlled and selective way are not likely to decide the tactics of urban counter-insurgency. And this is true not only because in the United States today the forces of repression are permeated with racist animosity but also because the extirpation of determined snipers from the ghetto jungles of America's large cities is, at the very least, an extremely difficult task, so that every effort in this direction tends to expand and intensify. Not only "walls" of fire but indiscriminate (and generally illegal) search-and-seizure operations involving multi-family dwellings or even entire city blocks seem to be inevitable elements of the counter-insurgency effort.

What this means is that the development of sniper warfare, which is a form of urban guerrilla warfare, will tend to involve the entire ghetto population, no matter how anxious many of the people concerned (amounting, very probably, to an absolute majority of the ghetto dwellers) may be to remain out of it. As in the case of other forms of guerrilla warfare, the intensification of the struggle in American ghettos seems likely to narrow and eventually eliminate any "neutral" ground between the opposing forces. It is not the wishes of the majority but the determination to fight of a militant minority plus the dialectic of the unfolding struggle itself which will decide who is and who is not to be drawn into the maelstrom.

It is important to understand that being drawn in means taking sides. Both the opposing forces will need and hence will increasingly demand the cooperation of the non-combatant population. A sniper fires from the roof of a building. The police enter in search, demanding that the residents reveal his identity and whereabouts. The sniper for his part needs their cooperation to hide or escape. In an individual case it may be possible to remain aloof, to claim ignorance, to refuse help. But with the generalization of the combat situation, this becomes increasingly difficult. What is involved is not one sniper and one building

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but many snipers and the whole ghetto. Under these circumstances the police will certainly resort to every trick in the bag of repression—threats, bribery, torture. And those subjected to this increasingly heavy pressure will sooner or later have to decide: either succumb and become tools of the police, or resist, which means joining or helping those who are already committed to the struggle.

There can be little doubt that the overwhelming majority of the ghetto dwellers will choose resistance. But not all. Historical and contemporary experience is unanimous in teaching that every society, every community, contains a potential fifth column. All struggles against oppression are therefore by their very nature wars on two fronts—against the "external" oppressor and against his "internal" allies and collaborators. And the implications of this fact for the American urban struggle are more far-reaching and complicated than might appear at first sight.

All accounts agree that the ghetto uprisings have so far been characterized by a high degree of spontaneity, i.e. by an absence of organization, advance planning, centralized leadership. This lack of structure corresponds to the nature of the uprisings as essentially protests, explosions of resentment and anger at an intolerable situation and those who personify it. Lacking a defined objective, let alone a coherent program, these elemental movements had no need for organization or leadership, except possibly at the level of the roving band or the small sniper detachment. The extension of urban guerrilla activity does not immediately change this situation: the motives can still be the same, the aims equally undefined. But now a new element enters the picture. In the face of the inevitable counter-offensive of the forces of repression, there develops an urgent need for collective self-defense, a need which arises primarily from the exigencies of the struggle on the "second front," i.e. the struggle against the enemy's fifth column of collaborators, infiltrators, provocateurs, and informers. Without the services of such a fifth column, an outside oppressor can do little but resort to indiscriminate violence (this, for example, is the situation of the United States in Vietnam today); with such services, if they are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well organized and efficiently directed, the outside oppressor can wreak havoc on a resistance movement, paralyzing it or even destroying it altogether.

Now it is obvious that an internal enemy cannot be fought by the methods of guerrilla warfare, nor can it be opposed on an individual or small-group basis. What is needed is a clandestine organization, disciplined, security-conscious, with a highly developed intelligence system enabling it to differentiate friend from foe, and above all possessed of the will and the moral authority in the community to mete out justice to those who betray the cause. As the struggle develops, such organizations will be needed in every ghetto which becomes involved; and since they will be needed, the chances are they will be created.

If this analysis is sound, it is the struggle which creates organizations and not the other way around. Once in existence, however, it is unlikely that such organizations will confine themselves to their original functions. By their very nature they will be "power structures" fighting in various ways against a hostile power structure. Regardless of conscious intention, in other words, they will be *political* organizations in the most straightforward sense of the term, and they can be expected to develop the normal attributes of political organizations. Without for a moment relaxing their necessarily clandestine anti-fifth-column activities, they will tend to form something like above-ground "liberation fronts" which will for the first time bring real political organization and representation to the ghetto masses, and these fronts will probably not only participate in routine political activities (e.g. elections) but will also take on economic and social functions which are normally the responsibility of constituted governments.

When it comes to political programs, it is necessary to distinguish between those which bear upon internal ghetto affairs and those which bear upon the relations between the ghetto and the rest of the world. In the first area—internal ghetto affairs—the new political organizations will have real power proportionate to the combativity of their guerrilla fighters and the depth and extent of their mass support. As these sources of strength develop, the ghetto becomes increasingly ungovernable, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hence also increasingly unexploitable, from outside. There comes a time when the outside exploiter is faced with the alternatives of waging a war of destruction and genocide or relinquishing some of its pretensions to power inside the ghetto. If it takes the latter course—and in the United States this seems likely, if only because of the inevitable adverse international repercussions of adopting a genocidal policy within the country—the ghetto will have won a significant measure of self-government. In this framework, programs for eliminating the worst evils of ghetto life and meeting some of the most urgent needs of the ghetto residents would take on real meaning (which of course they totally lack as long as the ghetto is the helpless object of outside exploiters). That this would be an enormous advance needs no emphasis, and the fact that it is a realistic prospect gives the lie to all those self-righteous fools and hypocrites who never tire of telling the heroic fighters of the ghetto that their efforts and sacrifices are in vain.*

When we turn to the second area with which the political programs of the emerging ghetto organizations must deal—relations between the ghetto and the outside world—we are confronted mostly with problems which appear to have no solution. It is becoming increasingly obvious to the black militants whose task is and will be to formulate the ideology and programs of the liberation movement that the root of the multiple illnesses which afflict United States society today is the whole system of capitalist-imperialist exploitation, of which the colored people at home and abroad are the special victims. Recognition of this truth has spread with astonishing rapidity in the last few years; hardly any illusions are left about the possibility of accomplishing anything by the methods of bourgeois democracy; and there

*It is perhaps a premonition that the struggle will be rewarded by such concrete and measurable gains that produces in so many ghetto-dwellers the feeling that the recent uprisings, despite their tragic toll in death and destruction, represent genuine victories. "In the Newark ghetto," a correspondent reports, "there's a feeling of 'victory' and 'unity.' They're saying, 'We don't want a white monkey on our backs, or a black monkey, or any kind of monkey. They've got a rotten society, let's build a decent one.' A beginning has been made." How strange that must sound to all those who can see only the destructive side, never the much more important and profound constructive aspect of these great historic events!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is certainly no disposition to believe that reforms inside the ghetto, however necessary and urgent, can do more than alleviate the plight of its residents. Blacks in the United States, in other words, are either already revolutionaries or well on the way to becoming revolutionaries.* And this fact must be reflected in, indeed must dominate, every aspect of their attitude toward the world outside the ghetto. This world must be revolutionized; there is no other hope.

But how is the world outside the ghetto to be revolutionized? Obviously it cannot be accomplished by the ghetto alone. We have already noted that a very real power potential exists within the ghetto, based on the combativity of the urban guerrillas and the mass support of the local population. But the extent to which this power can be directed outward and brought to bear on the larger society is very limited. This is most obvious in a military sense. If a black guerrilla band ventures out of the ghetto, it must operate in an entirely hostile environment from which it can expect no help whatever. In these circumstances it must either limit itself to a shallow foray and a quick retreat or face certain encirclement and annihilation. But even such harassing forays can be prevented: the enemy has only to cordon off the ghetto, set up check points for exit and entry, and establish a mobile reserve to deal with any break-out attempts. (City and state governments may in any case adopt a policy of cor-

*This was graphically demonstrated at the Black Power Conference held in Newark the week after the uprising in that city. In an angry and shocked lead editorial of July 24th, the *New York Times* described the mood of the Conference in the following terms: "Publicized originally as an attempt to promote dialogue among all factions in the Negro Community, the conference very quickly began to evidence radicalization of the moderates with little if any sign of reverse influences. Even on the first day, Newark's Commissioner of Human Rights, Alfred Black, was moved to declare, 'A black man today is either a radical or an Uncle Tom.' . . . The outcome might have been less tragic if some of the outstanding moderate Negro leaders had attended, or if the meeting had not taken place in Newark so soon after that city's recent racial disaster. But these considerations should not lead to an excessive discounting of the testimony this meeting gave about the increasing radicalization of many Negroes. Moreover the delegates at Newark merely spoke about revolution. In the streets of the nation's cities this summer, many young Negroes have given bloody evidence that they are willing to be revolutionary in deed."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doning off the ghettos as a logical adjunct of a comprehensive program of surveillance and control.)

If the military power which the ghetto can bring to bear on its environment is small, this is no less true of its political power in the traditional sense. Here the chief weapon of the ghetto-dweller is the vote. Insofar as it is used to elect officials within the ghetto who are genuinely representative of the masses, the vote obviously has importance. But as a means of putting pressure on city, state, and federal governments it is practically valueless. If the ghetto sends its own representatives to outside governmental bodies, they are in a hopeless minority. And if it uses its votes to support one or other of the establishment political machines, it simply helps to decide the particular identity of its oppressors.

The relative powerlessness of the ghetto vis-à-vis the outside world naturally tends to give rise to utopian thinking. If we cannot overthrow this sick society which is oppressing us, let us —so the argument runs—withdraw from it and build our own new and decent society. This is the common denominator of all the separatist schemes which have been a recurring feature of black political thinking in the United States during the last century and a half. For a long time the leitmotif was "back to Africa"; in the 1930's it was "self-determination in the Black Belt" (i.e. in those contiguous counties, of several Southern states, in which the black population at the time constituted an absolute majority); Elijah Muhammad's Nation of Islam proclaims by its very name the wish for an entirely separate black nation (on land, it would appear, to be ceded by white America by way of reparation for past wrongs inflicted on blacks). More recently, other forms of separatism have been proposed: one, for example, is cast in terms of blacks' taking power by constitutional means in two Southern states (Mississippi and Alabama) and seceding from the United States; another envisages something like a sovereign league of black-controlled cities.

We believe that all these separatist schemes are utopian in the sense that they present visions of what is, from their authors' point of view, a desirable future without ever proposing any rational or realistic means of achieving that future. And we be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lieve that this lack of relation between ends and means is in no sense accidental: it flows from a widespread failure to understand that separation from American capitalist-imperialist society is not and cannot be a substitute for revolutionizing it. Separation, if it is still wanted,* can come only after a revolution, not before.

The reason for this is twofold. First, the capitalist-imperialist system created its black ghettos, exploits them in various ways to its own profit and advantage, and means to hold on to them.** And second, the system has the power to hold on to them. As we have already suggested, the system may find it advisable to yield some powers inside the ghetto in view of the fierceness and determination of the black struggle. But this will by no means signify the end of exploitation of the ghetto, which will continue as long as the essential economic relations remain those of the capitalist market; and, as we have also seen, the ghetto lacks the means to project its power outside its own narrow confines.

The chances are that in the near future separatism, despite its demonstrably utopian character, will occupy a more, not less, important place in the thinking of black revolutionaries. They are understandably impatient, and impatience has a way of distorting one's sense of realism. But experience will show that in practice separatism is a blind alley offering no escape from the capitalist-imperialist trap. And when that time comes, we are confident that black revolutionaries will see the sheer neces-

*On this point the experience of Cuba is particularly relevant since Cuba is the only society with a racial history broadly similar to that of the United States which has had a socialist revolution. Even bourgeois observers, bitterly hostile to revolutionary Cuba, have to admit that what was once a racist state is no longer so. To quote James Reston, writing from Havana in the *New York Times* of August 2nd, "whatever else Cuba is, it is not a racist state. There is probably less anti-racial and anti-religious feeling here than in any other nation in the hemisphere." What the importance of this experience for American blacks is now or may be at some time in the future, however, will have to be decided by them and not by anyone else.

**In addition to the economic motive, there is also a very important political motive behind this determination not to allow blacks to escape. If they can simply walk out of the center of the empire, all those in the super-exploited periphery will be greatly encouraged to follow their example.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sity of seeking, which also means helping to create, allies outside their own ranks.

Not, to be sure, among whites, but among Reds. For as Cuba has already shown, and as the rest of Latin America will increasingly emphasize, the important thing in the present global struggle is not the color of one's skin but the color of one's politics.

In the meantime, black revolutionaries have plenty of work to do in consolidating their power and using it in the areas where it can be effectively exercised. Those of us who are outside these areas also have our work to do in laying the groundwork for the day when a common struggle for common aims will be possible.

(August 2, 1967)

PAGES FROM A NEGRO WORKER'S NOTEBOOK

is the subtitle of James Boggs' book

The American Revolution

Published in 1963, it foretold with amazing perception what is happening today in the urban ghettos of the United States. For example:

"The development and momentum of the Negro struggle have made the Negroes the one revolutionary force dominating the American scene. . . . The Negro revolt will lead to armed struggle between Negroes and whites, Negroes and Negroes, and Federal troops and armed civilians, and will have to move to political power and economic power. . . . Negroes began to appreciate that although they are in a minority in the United States they are a majority in the world, and that what in the United States is portrayed as a race question is on a world scale the question of the rights of the majority of the human race."

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

MR PRESS

116 West 14th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011—$1
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England—7s.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO LETTERS TO THE TIMES

Ghetto Reprisals

To the Editor:

Race riots that are bringing death and destruction to our American cities are saying something to us—if only we have ears to hear.

They are saying, first, that burning, looting and killing are Black Power's reprisals for the intolerable living conditions in the black ghettos of the nation; reprisals for the rat-infested tenements, the overcrowding, lack of adequate educational and job opportunities, the galling humiliation of second-class citizenship, the disillusionment and despair attendant upon poverty and destitution.

And coming through loud and clear is the warning that burning, looting and killing will continue, with increasing destructiveness, so long as these conditions remain unchanged.

The riots are saying, second, that pouring thousands of lives and billions of dollars into a war against Communism half-way around the world does not make sense while we placidly and self-righteously overlook conditions that breed Communism here at home. Thundering from every hilltop in Vietnam are these withering words: "Physician, heal thyself!"

JOHN C. SLEMP

Right to Rebel

To the Editor:

The men who founded this nation believed that when a people were oppressed, and their pleas for justice were ignored, and they were denied all redress for their legitimate grievances, then that people had a moral right to rise up against their government and throw off its yoke. The Negro ghetto dwellers of this nation are oppressed; their pleas for justice have been ignored; the Congress of the United States mocks their misery; their peaceful demonstrations make no change in the oppression.

The conclusion is obvious and inescapable; American Negroes have as much right to rebel now as the patriots of 1776 had then.

Can anyone maintain that the British rule was more oppressive than that of the modern slum? Are Stokely Carmichael's speeches more inflammatory than those of Patrick Henry?

The tragedy of the riots is not that they are happening, but that they will fail. For unlike the patriots of Colonial America, today's oppressed Negroes are a minority, without a genuine chance to free themselves as the colonies once did. Until the injustice of the ghetto is eliminated, the American Government is illegitimate, and no decent man has a moral obligation to obey it.

ROBERT PAUL WOLFF

—New York Times, July 30, 1967

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEED FOR REVOLUTION

BY FLOYD B. McKISSICK

The following are excerpts from a speech by the national director of the Congress of Racial Equality to the Black Power conference held in Newark, New Jersey, in July, 1967.—The Editors.

We are given rhetoric about power sharing: "The Land of the Free. Home of the Brave." "With liberty and justice for all." I could name dozens of others that sound beautiful, but mean absolutely nothing for black people, here or on any other continent.

They were never intended to mean anything for black people. They were written when we were still slaves.

There are black people starving in Mississippi, millions of colored people starving in India while white Americans bask in luxury, spending millions to go to the moon, billions on a war in Vietnam which pits yellow people against yellow people.

There are rebellions throughout the United States—black people demanding that they no longer be exploited, that they be free—free to live in dignity. . . .

And who is to blame for the rebellions? This point we need not argue. The white man is the judge, jury and the executioner in his system and he first made the law so as to control us. We are called the violators of his "law and order"—"criminals."

Yet he knows that the white racist society is to blame for all of the conditions which force a man to rebel. His concept of "law and order" means the legal methods of exploiting blacks. We object and we resist.

Some so-called Negro leaders even have the audacity to join the man—by calling a liberation struggle a riot—his brothers hoodlums and criminals—and damning his brothers who seek to overthrow the yoke of oppression. . . .

In this country, the ghetto is not defined by barbed wire: the ghetto follows the black man wherever he goes. . . .

Yes, black people know fear and live with it each and every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day of their lives—in deadly fear of the white man's potential. We know he can kill, we know he will—because of his hurt pride—we know that his personality demands that he control whatever he sees, we know that normal dissent is treason in his blue eyes.

In fact, we know the man better than he knows himself. We know him for what he is. We know he will kill us if he can—one by one or all at once. . . .

Even our friends in the peace movement find it too easy to look thousands of miles away from home and, with much indignation, see the extermination of the Vietnamese.

On the other hand, they cannot see 10 blocks away, where many black people are the walking dead—dead in mind and spirit, because of lack of hope and lack of chance.

We cannot look elsewhere for help. We cannot lean on the crutch of religion. We cannot depend on phony "coalitions." We must work out our own methods. We must draw our own conclusions.

To those queasy individuals who are afraid of the resolutions presented here, let me state my unequivocal opinion: The right of revolution is a constitutional right, condoned by the creation of the American Constitution itself. When we assert the right of revolution, we are asserting a constitutional right.

Revolution in America is justified by all standards of morality—religious and ethical: It is required to fulfill the basic, natural rights of man.

Even white men recognized the need for revolution when, in 1776, they revolted because they were oppressed. And today —1967—black people are more oppressed than any white man has ever been—in the history of the world.

This is the time when we must unite—brothers and sisters. We must join in making plans. . . .

Has not the experience of two centuries shown that gradualism in theory is perpetuity in practice? Is there an instance, in the history of the world, where slaves have been educated for freedom by their taskmasters?

—William Lloyd Garrison, The Liberator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAPITAL AND IMPERIALISM: A LANDMARK IN MARXIST THEORY

BY HORACE B. DAVIS

Contemporary Marxist theory condemns imperialist expansion as involving not only exploitation but retardation of development in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Marx and Engels, however, did not have this point of view at first. Down to the middle of the 1860's their pronouncements on colonialism were ambivalent. It was not until the publication of *Capital* in 1867 that the contradictions were resolved. (Even then, vestiges of the earlier views persisted in the works of Engels until a much later date.)

When Marx and Engels began their collaboration in 1845, they were favorably disposed to capitalist expansion. The development of a world market was described as in the interests of progress.

Enthusiasm is not too strong a word to describe the way in which *The Northern Star* (London) received in January, 1848, the news that the French attempt to occupy Algeria was being crowned with success. The Paris correspondent of this labor paper rejoiced that the reactionary Bedouin chief Abd-el-Kader had finally been taken. Engels was the Paris correspondent of *The Northern Star* and was in Paris at the time this dispatch was written; he never disavowed it, though whether he actually wrote it is not definitely known.[1]*

Where two expanding capitalist nations competed for the domination over some backward area, the sympathies of Marx and Engels were with the more progressive of the two capitalist dominators. Thus the United States conquest of Mexico in 1847-48 was endorsed on the ground that Mexico was bound

---

The material in the present article is taken from the book *Nationalism and Socialism: Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917*, which has just been published by Monthly Review Press.

* Footnotes will be found at the end of the article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to fall prey either to the United States or England, and of the two the United States was the more progressive. Even the annexation by the United States of a great part of Mexico's territory failed to stir their ire. The energetic Yankees would develop California in a way that the "lazy Mexicans" could not or would not.

Even Tsarist Russia was capable of exercising a civilizing influence in backward areas such as the East, in the view of Marx and Engels.[2] But to the activities of Tsarist Russia in Europe, Marx and Engels always showed the strongest hostility. The two were uncompromising foes of Panslavism, including that version presented by Bakunin in democratic garb. Even the protestations of the Czechs and South Slavs that they were not in favor of Panslavism, as in the Slavic Congress held in Prague on May 31, 1848, failed to impress them.[3]

Engels especially seems never to have missed a chance to inveigh against the "relics of small peoples" who inhabited Southeastern Europe. His attitude was the more surprising since he recognized the possibility that a federation of South Slavs might coagulate around Serbia, and that such a new state would have national aims different from and in part opposed to those of the Russian Tsar.[4]

Marx was more objective in his attitude to the South Slavs; he applauded the Rumanians for having preserved their language and their culture in Transylvania at a time when both were being suppressed in Wallachia and Moldavia.[5] But even Marx seems always to have preserved a belief in the "civilizing mission" of Germany in Eastern Europe. Like Engels, he showed little interest in the rights of small nationalities as such. Engels favored the Prussian annexation of the province of Schleswig, on the border of Denmark and populated largely by Danes, as an "expression of the right of civilization over barbarism, of progress over stagnation."[6] The right to self-determination, said Engels in 1866, must be limited to the "large, well-defined historical nations of Europe."[7]

The 1850's and early 1860's were a period of transition in the attitude of Marx and Engels on colonialism.

Some ten years after he had, in effect, endorsed the French

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occupation of Algeria, Engels had become aware that things were not working out for the best interests of the Algerians. In an article written in 1857 for the *New American Cyclopedia,* he even paid tribute to the "intrepidity" of Abd-el-Kader, while condemning the inhumanity of the French tactic of *razzias,* or raids accompanied by the destruction of native villages which resisted the conquerors. "The indigenous population is still governed by a hand of iron," he wrote, and the legal proceedings against Captain Doineau in 1857 "revealed the cruelty and the despotism which the French officials, even those of minor rank, habitually use in their administration of power." Very significantly, the *Cyclopedia* article described the birth of a national spirit among the Algerians as a result of the French occupation:

> From the first occupation of Algeria by the French . . . the unhappy country has been the arena of unceasing bloodshed, rapine, and violence. . . . The Arab and Kabyle tribes, to whom independence is precious, and hatred of foreign domination a principle dearer than life itself, have been crushed and broken by the terrible *razzias*. . . . The tribes still assert their independence and detestation of the French regime. . . .

The same volume of the *Cyclopedia* contained a laudatory article on Abd-el-Kader, who was depicted as a kind of "father of his country." This article may also have been written by Engels.

Of course, it must not be assumed that the progressive American editors of the *Cyclopedia,* George Ripley and Charles A. Dana, got their anti-colonialism from Engels. It could have been the other way around. It was not until the 20th century that anti-imperialism finally ceased to be fashionable in the United States, in liberal circles. But it is known that Engels wrote the first draft of the article on Algeria, and he is said to have complained later to Marx that parts of his description of the movement led by Abd-el-Kader were edited out.[8]

The shift from an acceptance of colonialism to active opposition is nowhere more strikingly demonstrated than in the case of Ireland.

In the 1840's Marx had advised the Irish workers to make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common cause with the Chartists, whom he expected to stage a workers' revolution that would result in freeing Ireland. Later, he favored using the Irish nationalist movement to break the power of the British landed aristocracy, first in Ireland and then in England. He contemplated independence for Ireland regretfully, and thought it might be followed by federation.[9] The main consideration here was economic development, which would be facilitated by retaining large units where they existed (and forming new ones where possible).

But here as elsewhere, realism and willingness to learn featured the writings of both Marx and Engels. The latter learned about Fenianism from his common-law wife Lizzie Burns, visited Ireland, and became so interested in the country that he set out to write its history.[10] Marx became aware of the prejudice against the Irish that had grown up in England during the 1850's, when the British workers resented the arrival of the new immigrants; this factor weakened his faith that the freedom of Ireland would be achieved in England.

In the end, Irish liberation came to occupy a leading place in Marx's thinking. It was not only an important issue for the British workers—it was *the most* important issue. When the International Workingmen's Association was founded in 1866, Marx was tireless in rallying the General Council, including the very moderate trade union leaders in Britain, on the side of the Irish national struggle.[11] Marx and Engels, against violent opposition, persuaded the Council members to regard Ireland as an independent nation.[12] In November, 1867, Marx wrote and the Council adopted a resolution addressed to Gathorn-Hardy, Home Secretary, protesting against the condemnation to death of three Fenians. Marx kept continental Europe in touch with the Irish situation; he published two articles in the *Internationale,* Brussels, in 1870, denouncing police methods in Ireland; at the same time he helped his daughter Jenny with eight articles on Ireland published in Rochefort's *Marseillaise.* The Council adopted numerous resolutions on Ireland; one especially, dated January 1, 1870, contained the apothegm: "The people which oppresses another is forging its own chains."[13] Marx wrote at this time a letter to S. Meyer and A. Vogt in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he commented: "The national emancipation of Ireland is [for the English workers] no question of abstract justice or humanitarian sentiment, but the first condition of their own social emancipation."[14]

It would be a pleasure to report that Marx opposed the British occupation of India from the beginning, and that he welcomed the uprising of 1857 as a first, albeit misguided, leap from freedom on the part of the Indians, as a recent study implies he did.[15] Marx was indeed an early and incisive critic of British misrule in India; few aspects of its sinister hypocrisy escaped him. But still he thought at first that in India, as in China, the local populace had to be shaken out of its age-old somnolence, and that capitalism was the chosen instrument of this work, however selfish its motives and however cruel its methods. Thus the Sepoy "mutiny" of 1867 did not greatly stir him; he tended to side with the British.[16]

But as the facts concerning colonialism accumulated, Marx's enthusiasm for capitalism as a transforming instrument cooled. From anticipating that the workers of the advanced countries would free the workers in the colonies, he had come to the point of view that the Indians might obtain their own independence before Britain went socialist.[17]

So, when the first volume of *Capital* appeared in 1867, no one had any special reason to be surprised that it contained a scorching denunciation of the evils of colonialism:

> The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation.[18]

Marx's discussion of colonialism revolved, as the above passage indicates, largely around the role which the colonies played in amassing capital. The feudal system had decayed; capitalism emerged as the ruling economic system. Where Hobson was later, most misleadingly, to characterise imperialism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the *result* of capital accumulation, Marx saw colonialism as a cause—the principal cause—of the capital accumulation which accompanied the early stages of modern capitalist development, and was to be followed by the industrial revolution. Where Hobson saw capital (as he thought) flowing to the colonies, Marx saw capital flowing from the colonies to the more advanced countries. Hobson considered bankers to be "the most timid of people" when it came to risking their capital, thus repeating an old myth that had flourished in the "city" since Marx's time. Marx had already found the answer to this contention. He quoted P. J. Dunning as follows:

> With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 percent will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 percent certain will induce eagerness; 50 percent, positive audacity; 100 percent will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 percent, and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged. If turbulence and strife will bring a profit, it will freely encourage both.[19]

The chapter in which Marx detailed the evils of colonialism is not very long; it does not include a fraction of all the damning facts that were even then available. But its very conciseness makes it all the more devastating. No one has since successfully challenged Marx's celebrated conclusion: "If money . . . 'comes into the world with a congenital bloodstain on one cheek,' capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt."[20]

This is not to say that Marx deplored the rise of colonialism. Actually, he considered that capitalism was vastly superior to feudalism, the system which it succeeded in Europe, just as Lenin considered that imperialism was progressive compared with preceding stages of capitalism. Marx and Engels even found an historical justification for slavery, though that is surely pushing the argument too far. But whatever he may have thought of the abuses connected with the "genesis of the industrial capitalist," Marx never implied that the continuation of such abuses into the late-modern period was other than shameful; and Marxism since 1867 has correctly condemned both the excesses

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the very fact of colonialism, in this day and age. Thus the First International, under the leadership of Marx and Engels, attacked British misrule in Ireland; and the Second International, founded in 1889 with Marxist inspiration, condemned colonialism from the start.

Just as Marx and Engels reversed themselves on the question of imperialist expansion, so they modified their stand on the matter of self-determination and the rights of small nationalities. Thus we find Engels in 1891 coming out for self-determination in Schleswig-Holstein, although a plebiscite there might have gone against the Germans and transferred the area from a larger polity to a smaller one.[21] Engels paved the way for later Marxists, such as Lenin, to incorporate self-determination explicitly as a canon of Marxist doctrine, in line with contemporary democratic demands.

Thus the earlier writings of Marx and Engels favoring imperialist expansion and opposing the claims of small peoples to national self-determination are seen to have been abandoned later. The anti-colonialists in the great debates of the early twentieth century were correctly considered to be in the current of orthodox Marxism; while the revisionists, like Bernstein, who found excuses for British rule in India, were correctly labeled capitalist apologists. Publicists of a later day have castigated Marx and Engels for writings of the 1840's which expressed a point of view that Marxism, and indeed Marx and Engels themselves, later abandoned. In this highly important respect, as in others, *Capital* represents a major turning point in Marxist theory.

FOOTNOTES

1. The article in question was attributed to Engels in the edition of the works of Marx and Engels published in 1932 under the supervision of the Marx-Engels Institute of Moscow. After further research the Institute modified its position; the edition of the *Works* of Marx and Engels which it published in 1963 does not contain the item.
2. Letter, Engels to Marx, May 23, 1851.
3. Cf. S. Harrison Thomson, "A Century of a Phantom: Panslavism and the Western Slavs," in *Journal of Central European Affairs* (Boulder, Col.), XI (Jan.-April, 1951), p. 60.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. Engels, article in *N.Y. Tribune,* April 21, 1853; see Marx-Engels, *Werke,* IX, 33-35.
5. Marx, *Insemnări despre Români* (Bucharest: 1964), p. 39.
6. *Werke,* V, 395.
7. *Werke,* XVI, p. 157.
8. [F. Engels], "Algeria," in *The New American Cyclopedia,* edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana, I (1865; copyright 1857), 350, 351; *Werke,* XVI, 724, n. 82.
9. Cf. Marx to Engels, Nov. 30, 1867; and Marx to S. Meyer and A. Vogt, April 9, 1870.
10. See *Werke,* XVI, 461-500, 675.
11. R. Palme Dutt, *The Internationale* (London: 1964), p. 67.
12. Cf. Marx's interventions in the General Council's meetings of Nov. 9, 16, 23, 30, 1869, in *Documents of the First International. The General Council of the First International 1868-1870. Minutes* (Moscow: 1966), pp. 176-194.
13. Marx, *Letters to Kugelmann* (London: 1935), p. 108.
14. Marx & Engels, *Letters to Americans* (International: 1953), p. 79. Engels had written already in 1856: "Ireland may be regarded as the first English colony. . . . The so-called freedom of English citizens is based on the oppression of the colonies." Letter to Marx, May 23, 1856.
15. Cf. *The First Indian War of Independence, 1857-1859* (Moscow 1959).
16. *Werke,* XV, 455; *The First Indian War, &c.,* quoted, pp. 34, 35.
17. *Werke,* IX, 224.
18. Marx, *Capital,* Kerr (1906) ed. (Modern Library, n.d.), p. 823.
19. *Ibid.,* p. 834n.
20. *Ibid.,* p. 834.
21. Engels, "Socialism in Germany" (1891); in *Werke,* XXII, 253.

You read, you're televised to, you're radioed to, you're preached to, that it is necessary that we have our armed forces fight, get killed and maimed, and kill and maim other human beings, including women and children, because now is the time we must stop some kind of unwanted ideology from creeping up on this nation. The place we choose to do this is 8,000 miles away with water in between. . . . I ask you, have you read or been instructed about any timetable of disaster for this nation and her world position if we hadn't done and weren't doing what we are in Southeast Asia today? I haven't. The reasons fed to us are too shallow and narrow for students, as well as other citizens. Especially so, when you realize that what is happening, no matter how carefully and slowly the military escalation has progressed, may be projecting us toward world catastrophe.

—General David M. Shoup, retired commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, May 14, 1966

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION?

BY K. S. KAROL

The following text is the introduction, written in April, 1967, to the Norwegian translation of the author's book *China: The Other Communism* (Hill and Wang, New York, 1967, $7.95). It was translated from the French by B. R. Brewster. K. S. Karol was born in Poland, received his higher education in the Soviet Union after 1939, and is now a journalist living in Paris and writing regularly in *Le Nouvel Observateur* and the London *New Statesman*. — The Editors.

"The Cultural Revolution will last a hundred years," proclaim the Chinese, as if they were warning us that surprising news will reach us from their country for a long time to come. Indeed, after the avalanche of surprises released on us from China in the second half of 1966 we are somewhat immunized against sensational reports from Peking. Even the popular press, eager for striking headlines, no longer talks of civil war or comparable calamities in its interpretations of the Cultural Revolution. The ground has now been slightly cleared, and even though it is still too early for a complete assessment of the last six months' events in China, it is possible to see a little more clearly, and examine dispassionately, what is at stake in this mighty battle among the Chinese Communists, and its probable consequences.

First of all, it is clear that several of the hypotheses put forward in the last few months by Sinologists and pro-Soviet Communists have been completely disproved by the development of the Chinese situation. Those who proclaimed the Cultural Revolution to be no more than a smoke-screen to hide the power struggle between Mao's successors must today admit that the old Chinese leader has no intention of leaving the political arena; so it is premature, to say the least, to talk of a battle for the succession. Events suggest that Mao Tse-tung now occupies an even more preponderant position in Chinese politics than in previous years, and that he uses this position to influence the development of his country.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As for those pro-Soviet Communists who claimed that the vast majority of the Chinese CP was prepared to accept the policies of the Soviet Union, so that Mao Tse-tung had to appeal to the masses and particularly to confused young people to secure his personal dictatorship, they have to admit that "this anti-Maoist Communist majority" has never been visible in any public stand, any propaganda or appeal which would enable us to grasp its political position. Now, the majority within a Communist Party usually controls the means of communication: the press and the radio. And even if an organized anti-Maoist faction which was only a minority had really existed, it would have found the means to express its point of view, since during the Cultural Revolution it was apparently easy to publish improvised newspapers or stick up posters at every street corner. After all, historical experience shows that if there really is a faction organized and involved in a death struggle, it will always succeed in expressing itself, even if only clandestinely. In the Soviet Union, in spite of repression, the Trotskyist minority succeeded in publishing an oppositional bulletin as long as it remained a real force within the CPSU.

We see no point in ignoring the evidence to the contrary and tagging along with explanations based solely on struggles between personalities at the top of the Chinese CP or between Maoists and anti-Maoists. Such clues will not enable us to decipher current events or predict their development. Our purpose is neither to praise nor to condemn the Chinese Cultural Revolution, but to understand and foretell what the recent upheavals portend for China.

For China is going through a transformation unprecedented in the history of a Communist-governed country. The whole state structure and even that of the Party have been put in question by the Cultural Revolution. New institutions are growing up bit by bit, and all the relations between rulers and ruled may well change. In order to understand the reasons for such revolutionary changes we must examine Chinese society in depth, and dispassionately study the problems it proposes to solve.

In *China: The Other Communism* the reader will find a description of Communist China as I found it during a long

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journey in 1965, so I do not propose to start by summarizing all the characteristics and peculiarities of Chinese society. I just want to point out a few elements of Chinese doctrine and policy which struck me during my stay in the country, and which have been remarkably emphasized by the Cultural Revolution. To me they seem essential to any analysis of all later events.

Thus Chinese leaders at various levels explained to me their absolute faith in the value of political stimuli. One hundred or even one thousand times they told me that Chinese workers are capable of exerting themselves unreservedly if they are working for a common cause, or in the name of a great idea, and not to obtain some egoistic material advantage. They spoke of the new Chinese man, completely impregnated with a collectivist ethic; and they cited the example of the hero Lei Feng who is venerated by everybody as a complete altruist. Strong in this conviction of the superiority of political incentives, the Chinese did not hide from me that for them the first priority was to inculcate in all citizens the altruist and collectivist mentality deriving from the new morality formulated by Mao Tse-tung. Hence their slogans: "Put Politics in Command," "Be Red and Expert," with "red" coming before "expert."

I have always found such a scale of priorities surprising, since it goes against the economic rationality to which we are accustomed in Europe. But our judgment is undoubtedly influenced by social customs which it would be arbitrary to attribute to a country with traditions as different from ours as those of China. For it is a fact that Chinese civilization developed in quite different conditions from ours, and that it has always given a high place, if not supremacy, to the rules of moral conduct. The French Sinologist Leon Vandermeersch has recently reminded us of this:

> For the Chinese, harmony is not the effect of legal dispositions marking the limits beyond which each man's liberty begins to encroach on that of another, but the direct internal transformation of man himself. This means that in many respects Chinese civilization appears to be based exclusively on morals. . . . In China, as in the West, social structures were constructed at an intermediate level between morals and instincts; but instead of being built up from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bottom, starting from the enclosure of the basic tendencies of man in more and more refined legal norms, these structures were established from the top by the disposition of the ideal order of morality in a practical order characterized by the word *li,* usually translated as "rite" for want of a better word. . . . The economy of Chinese civilization was thus built on an ideological centralization as extreme as the decentralization of the state. The four hundred million subjects of the Emperor Tsing in the 19th century were governed less by the intervention of some tens of thousands of mere functionaries than by the empire of ideas and the strength of the ritual which took the place of a civil code. (*Esprit,* March, 1967.)

The historical chapter of this book will show that Mao and his comrades-in-arms successfully implanted themselves in one of the least endowed regions of China, the Northwest, traditionally in the grip of famine, by demonstrating to the semi-literate peasants that they were the bearers of a new ritual which was collectivist and beneficial to all. Thus, thanks to their exemplary conduct, they were able to awaken the peasant masses for the struggle and to make them the spearhead of the Revolution. But this experience marked them in their turn, convincing them of the absolute priority of ideas and rituals over all other aspects of social life. Mao Tse-tung thus became not only a political strategist, but above all a moralist who gave China a new doctrine of behavior and action.

Thus for several years the diffusion of the "thought of Mao Tse-tung" has been the alpha and omega of the Communist regime. In this thought every Chinese worker must find the inspiration for the altruistic behavior which will assure him happiness and which is necessary for the whole collectivity. And the more the masses assimilate this thought, the more prosperous will be the country and those of its citizens who are devoted to the Revolution. The campaign for socialist education which was at its height while I was visiting China had no other end than to propagate in intense doses the moral recipes of the Chinese Communist leader. And all projects for the future were based on the conviction that this thought of Mao Tse-tung was assimilable by everyone and that it was capable of providing the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cement for the new Communist Chinese civilization.

The present Cultural Revolution must be seen in the light of this belief. Its promoters have publicly claimed that their goal is the extirpation of the old customs which remain alive in the new society and constitute an obstacle to its development. "The Cultural Revolution touches everyone in his deepest part," proclaims an official slogan. But individuals are not capable of introspection in solitude: they are formed and educated through action. The masses must therefore rebel against everything hindering their ideological conversion and criticize the old culture as much as the new institutions.

This appeal to the masses which many find irrational fits perfectly into the logic of Maoist ideology. If everyone must work in the name of politics, this politics must represent for him a concrete value, it must be the first of all his preoccupations. Discussions with the Chinese convinced me that the logic of their system implies a process of democratization quite different from that which took place in the Eastern countries after Stalin's death. But at that time we were thinking primarily in terms of an evolutionary process which would be accomplished little by little in parallel with the material progress of society. The Cultural Revolution represents a leap in the same direction, but is necessarily more violent, and, no doubt, more radical.

The Chinese claim that Mao Tse-tung decided in person to make the country take this step so as to allow it "to adjust its ideological superstructure to the changes which had been produced in the economic and social infrastructures of China over the last seventeen years." If we accept this thesis, China needed a certain institutional framework to proceed with the nationalization of industry and the collectivization of the countryside; but, with time, this had to be transformed the better to allow the masses to assimilate the new ideology and the better to deploy all their energies right away. In fact, although Chinese texts modestly refrain from speaking publicly of the bureaucratic phenomenon that threatens all post-revolutionary societies, Mao Tse-tung has apparently reached the conclusion that the Chinese Communist Republic is secreting, almost naturally, a superabundant and omnipresent bureaucracy which could, by force

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of circumstance, follow the same course as the Soviet bureaucracy.

Now the Chinese Communist leader has for a long time been obsessed with the danger of the crystallization of new political or technical élites which would monopolize power and behave as if they were a new bourgeoisie. During our stay in China it was explained to us that the officials in all government services were compelled to perform periods of manual work so as to remain closer to the masses and avoid contamination with an élitist spirit. We were assured that every factory director worked at least a day and a half a week as a simple worker; that each army general became for one month a year a simple private; and that all the leaders, even the most important ones, went off in the agricultural season to work on the land in the communes. We also saw that the intellectuals, students as well as professors, had to spend a large part of their time in manual work. But since the outburst of the Cultural Revolution the Chinese press has revealed to us that these measures were insufficient, that they were merely palliatives which did not prevent "a minority of leaders occupying major posts from taking the capitalist road." Why?

Without saying so in so many words, the Chinese theoreticians clearly imply that the fault rests with the undemocratic character of the institutions and the rigid structure of the Communist Party. A Chinese administrator may have been forced to lead a modest life, but his powers were nevertheless enormous. In the last resort he and his peers were the arbiters of everything, without the governed having any control over them. The Communist Party—and in fact its higher-level leaders—was alone able to choose the best technical methods, to establish economic priorities, and to choose all the options of national life and foreign policy.

Of course these administrators were old Communists; but according to Mao, this did not shield them from being corrupted by power. Mao Tse-tung, never an *apparatchik* (at one stage of his life he had even been seriously rebuffed by the bureaucracy of the Comintern and by his own Party), always feared, it seems, that this new governmental stratum might finally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invoke the argument of administrative necessity in defense of its own interests. For him, the USSR evolved in the revisionist direction he abominates precisely because the Soviet bureaucracy created an ideology of its own which contradicted that of the Communist movement. And it did not even need to resort to a revolution or coup to impose on the whole country and on the CPSU its new and pernicious ideology. As all power was concentrated at the top it sufficed that the top be converted to revisionism and everyone else, always obliged to obey, was again led by discipline, this time into the way of damnation.

Now Mao Tse-tung knew perfectly well that Chinese institutions and the structure of the Chinese CP had remained very similar if not identical to those existing in Russia, despite the estrangement of the last few years. If it was possible for a Khrushchev to succeed in so many of what Mao saw as misdeeds almost 40 years after a socialist revolution, how could he be sure that one day some Chinese "ruling traitor" would not sabotage the conquests and heritage of the Chinese Revolution in the same way? For several years the specter of Khrushchevism visibly haunted Mao Tse-tung's mind. His purpose in releasing the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" was to demolish once and for all the political conditions which might one day have permitted the birth of revisionism in China. By means of this step, Mao hoped to guarantee the ideological purity of his revolution for the generations to come.

Mao Tse-tung has said: "If Marxism-Leninism could be summed up in a single sentence, it would be: to rebel is justified." According to the Chinese leader, this right to rebellion does not disappear after the victory of the revolution. The masses therefore have at any moment the right to criticize those who govern them; while a good Communist must never refuse popular criticism, just as he must never be a docile instrument in the hands of his superiors. A reading of Maoist proclamations in the Cultural Revolution even gives the impression that Mao would like to institutionalize disobedience of superior authorities, thus erecting a permanent barrier against the men in power.

But at first sight this invitation to the masses to criticize all those in administrative authority and all existing institutions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might seem to contain an enormous risk. How can such criticisms be prevented from turning against the Communist regime as such, thus benefiting the counter-revolutionaries? It seems to me that Mao Tse-tung dared to launch the slogan of the Cultural Revolution precisely because he was convinced that his prestige had reached a sufficient level in China to constitute a sort of lightning-conductor which would prevent the thunderbolts of criticism from striking at the Communist regime and the Party as a whole. Mao's premise was that his doctrine—resumed in the famous Little Red Book of quotations—had already so penetrated the minds of the Chinese that no one would think of committing the sacrilege of attacking it in public. Now Mao Tse-tung does not just incarnate himself: at the same time he personifies the popular regime and the Chinese CP. If the "thought of Chairman Mao" cannot be criticized, the legitimacy of the Chinese Revolution and the socialist perspective that it has opened before the country cannot be questioned either.

And it is true that in spite of the innumerable possibilities of expression created by the Cultural Revolution, no one has used them to revolt against Mao. Despite all the speculation of foreign experts, despite the insinuations of the Soviet leaders, there is not even a shadow of proof of the existence of an anti-Maoist Communist movement in China. Experience has shown that for a Chinese, and above all for a Communist Chinese, it is morally impossible to shout "Down with Mao Tse-tung," just as it would be impossible for a priest to shout "Down with God" without losing his *raison d'être* as a man of faith and departing from the spiritual perspective that gives his life its meaning. In the last few months we have seen the extraordinary birth of all sorts of revolutionary committees, in universities and in factories, and even, it appears, in the distant countryside, but they have all outbid one another in their fidelity to the thought of the great man. They have all set themselves the task of vying with one another in the promotion of the new morality approved by the founder of Communist China.

But if Mao—and thanks to him the CP as a whole—has been above criticism, this has not been true of the other Communist leaders. In fact, the number of high-level officials of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regime who have escaped attack from the Red Guards or revolutionary rebels can literally be counted on the fingers of one hand. To be able to criticize a Communist leader in power without immediately being accused of having attacked the Party as a whole is obviously unique in the annals of the Communist movement and in itself constitutes an innovation which is very disturbing in the eyes of foreign Communists. It is more than likely that this innovation was no more appreciated by the Communist old guard in China which suddenly found itself without any official protection from the frequently incoherent criticism unleashed from the base. It is obvious that this radical questioning of the old system was not to the taste of the men in power and that of necessity it aroused individual resistance or despair.

The texts published in Peking are obviously one-sided and glorify solely the promoters of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." Those who have not joined the movement or who have tried to hinder it—if we can believe official pronouncements—are usually covered with invective without their case being presented in any coherent fashion. Only by reading between the lines of these indictments can we work out more or less what were the "real crimes" of those refractory to the Cultural Revolution. It seems that no important leader thought himself of sufficient stature to dissuade Mao from launching the slogan of this remarkable revolution. But in the first phase it was Liu Shao-chi's group which controlled the Party apparatus and took the operation in hand. The old number two of the regime apparently sent out into all the excited institutions official work teams charged with carrying out some kind of purge from above, thus satisfying "the base in rebellion." Only in August 1966 did the Central Committee meet at the orders of Mao Tse-tung so that he could explain to them that the Cultural Revolution could not be carried out like this, and that the base itself must throw itself into a critical campaign without any outside assistance. The Central Committee therefore charged a small group to watch over this critical phase of the movement without any direct intervention. The men who had until then retained control over the apparatus, such as Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, were, in fact, deprived of any real power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But popular spontaneity occasionally took on proportions not altogether foreseen by the initiators of the Cultural Revolution. The call for criticism was visibly interpreted by the base as a kind of obligation to set themselves against all those who had been governing up to then. Instead of a vast rational debate between rulers and ruled on the precise faults of institutions or administrators, the Cultural Revolution provoked a kind of generalized collision between the new committees "issuing from the revolutionary masses" and the old administration. What is more, in many factories the workers profited by their freedom to elect their committees to demand increases in wages which were often retroactive. China was nearly threatened by semi-anarchy and a kind of power vacuum. Luckily for the Chinese, the promoters of the Cultural Revolution had a temporary substitute administration in the Army cadres. For the Maoists the Army had always been as much a political as a military instrument, and they did not fail to use it once again where the economy or administration seemed paralyzed. But even though very peaceful, this Army intervention could obviously only be a temporary and inadequate solution.

Therefore, from January on, Mao Tse-tung and the Central Committee of the CP launched an urgent appeal to the workers of Shanghai—where the situation seemed most chaotic—to form new institutions and set the largest city in China in motion once again. If we can believe the official version, this appeal received an immediate response, and a provisional Revolutionary Committee was set up on the basis of the "triple alliance." It was in fact composed of representatives of the masses, of the Army, and of revolutionary Party cadres. "The Shanghai victory" immediately stimulated the other cities, and almost everywhere analogous committees began to be formed. Then, to give this new phase theoretical justification, the Maoists republished with much publicity Mao Tse-tung's study of "The Elimination of Erroneous Conceptions in the Party" which dates from December, 1929. Even at that time Mao Tse-tung warned his comrades of the danger of ultra-democratism and ultra-egalitarianism. "The principal task of criticism," he wrote, "is to bring to light political errors and organizational faults. As for personal faults, if they are not linked to political errors they should not be too severely criticized for fear of leaving the comrades adrift.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Further, if such criticism arises, the attention of the Party organization will be diverted onto small matters, and the comrades will become over-punctilious men who get lost in trifles and forget the political tasks of the Party: this is a great danger."

Echoing this warning, Chou En-lai addressed himself to the masses in a series of popular meetings in Peking to demand "correct treatment for Party cadres"; a little later the Red Guards returned to their universities, street demonstrations ceased, and the Cultural Revolution visibly entered into calmer waters.

It even seemed that China was going to return bit by bit to normal, and that each would return to his old position: the students to the lecture halls, the workers to their factories, the cadres to their posts in the administration. The Cultural Revolution would thus be reduced to a sort of electric shock for the rulers which would not have altered sensibly their position in society. There was even talk of a compromise between the innovators and the administrators, and such a compromise was explained as inevitable since China needed both ideologists to stimulate the new morality and practical cadres to assure its economic development.

But it does not seem that Mao wished for such a return to the *status quo ante,* nor was it acceptable to those who had actively participated in several months of major agitation. The battle for new institutions, initiated by the "triple alliance," has been resumed. But this time the slogan is no longer "criticism of large numbers." "The majority of the cadres are good or good enough," proclaims the Central Committee, recommending that they should be incorporated in the new institutions so that they can "serve the people" under the control of the base.

Only one major official who symbolized the old system, Liu Shao-chi, has been offered up for the opprobrium of the masses. The press has published a great variety of charges against him, proclaiming that his purpose was to use the old party discipline to become the "Chinese Khrushchev." Among other crimes, he is charged with having republished his work "How to be a Good Communist" in 1962, which contained the statement: "A Communist must obey everything which has been adopted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and fixed by the majority, by the higher ranks or by the Central Committee of the Party. He must obey even what is incorrect. At this very moment it is particularly important to observe discipline, to obey the higher ranks and the Central Committee, whether they be right or wrong." He even said: "When truth is on the side of the minority and the majority supports what is incorrect, the minority must nevertheless obey the majority in everything. . . . To submit to the organization, to the majority and the higher ranks, all this is absolute and unconditional."

Today the Maoists oppose to these statements of Liu Shao-chi those of Mao Tse-tung who said, in one of his letters to the Central Committee of the CPSU: "The question of who is right and who wrong cannot be decided by a majority of votes when what is at stake is the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism." But what seems to have been forgotten in this debate is that, in his work, Liu Shao-chi was summing up the doctrine of so-called democratic centralism which governs all Communist parties, and which has up to now been approved and obligatory for the Chinese Communists. If Mao has then decided to stage this retrospective trial of Liu Shao-chi, it must mean that he is determined to change this system and regards his old comrade-in-arms as too compromised to be rehabilitated.

The experts are now wondering who will pronounce the dismissal of Liu Shao-chi who is still, in name, President of the Republic. But the question seems purely academic, since it is more than likely that the National Popular Assembly, sole body empowered to elect or replace the Chief of State, will never be recalled. In this country, in the course of a complete restructuration, there are congresses every day of the various revolutionary organizations which have seen the light during the last few months, and which will probably make up the skeleton of a new Popular Assembly modelled after that of the Russian Soviets of 1917.

As for the Chinese Communist Party, it will also have to integrate into its statutes the Maoist principles of the relation between the base and higher ranks, and this will make it a party very different from what it was and what the other Communist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movements are. Mao Tse-tung untiringly repeats: "The masses cannot be mistaken. In them rests the only valuable creative force." To be able to obtain constant inspiration from this sole source of wisdom, it seems that the Chinese Communist Party will have to be radically transformed.

It is still impossible to answer all the questions raised by the new Chinese policy. We do not have sufficient knowledge of the difficulties or successes met by the attempt at a "triple alliance," nor of the concrete life of all these provisional committees which will in future have to administer China. The torrent unleashed by Mao Tse-tung will not quietly return to its bed, and many more events will take place in China before we will be able to assess the results of the Cultural Revolution. But it is essential to think of the reality of China and the aspirations of its leaders if we are going to follow these events as they unfold day by day. It is also essential to keep constantly in mind that whatever their long-term ideological preoccupations, they are obliged to concern themselves with their country's powers of defense; for there has probably been no country in all history which has been as threatened as China is today, when it might any day be the victim of the aggression of the American giant armed with thermonuclear bombs.

Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must certainly advance; it must develop along with the development of practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it remained stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, or otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid. It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism.

—*Mao Tse-tung,* 1957

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS *is proud to announce publication of*

Toward the African Revolution

By FRANTZ FANON

A few years after his death at the age of thirty-six, Frantz Fanon is already a legend, and his books, passionate and powerful, have become the axis of all serious study into the psychology of oppression, oppressors, and oppressed.

In **Toward the African Revolution,** Fanon employs his professional training in psychiatry and his lifetime of experience with colonialism to explore the goals of the African struggle. For men depersonalized by centuries of colonial oppression, there is only one struggle—to once again become men. And in this book, despite its scientific rigor, Fanon brings to bear that passion which makes it impossible for any reader to assume the role of observer, but compels him to take sides as accuser or accused.

■

Price on publication September 28:	**$6.50**	**46s.**
Prepublication:	**$5.00**	**36s.**
Associates price:	**$3.25**	**23s.**

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

■

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Growth Rate Zero

Presidential economic advisers have worked out a Keynesian plan to stimulate United States economy when it lags, and to restrain it when it goes too fast. Earlier in his presidential term Mr. Johnson assured voters that the economy was well in hand. He even hinted that permanent stability at a reasonable growth rate was assured.

Recent economic events have called into question the Keynesian assumptions and Johnsonian conclusions. Instead of moving upward at the expected rate, the growth of the economy during the past twelve months has been less than nothing. Factual and statistical support for this assertion appeared in the *Economic Notes* issued by the Labor Research Association (799 Broadway, New York City) for July 1967. The Federal Reserve Board index, based on 1957-59 as 100, stood at 156.5 in June 1966, 159.0 in December and 155.2 in June 1967. Actually the United States growth rate, June 1966 to June 1967, is below zero.

Supporters of Keynesian policy may argue, and with justice, that business index performance for twelve months is no adequate proof of anything beyond the twelve months. But this indication of stagnation is only one of many signs that United States economy is not responding to the Johnsonian "consensus" treatment.

Turn from the stagnation of the general business index to the question of consumer spending. Consumer income has been rising steadily during recent months, but consumer spending has not increased at the same rate. In fact, consumer spending, like the business index, is stagnating.

Presumably consumers, with more money in pocket or savings accounts, are so unsure of the economic future that they are waiting and wondering whether to spend or not to spend. This mood is further illustrated by the present trend of consumers to buy necessaries such as food and delay the purchase

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of appliances and other more or less durable items such as automobiles. The economy stagnates. Consumers, hesitating to spend, give an additional push toward stagnation.

Rising prices add to consumer anxiety, especially where incomes are fixed and do not move up with prices. Inflation is no respecter of persons. When prices go up, all consumers find that their dollars buy less and their living standard suffers accordingly.

Population, increasing persistently in the United States, requires a like increase in the economic growth rate in order to maintain even a static standard of living. A population increase, without a corresponding rise in production and income, must lower living standards. Price inflation adds still another problem by reducing the purchasing power of the dollar.

Any rational economist, facing this confrontation of adverse factors, would flash a red light to the Administration. The economic road ahead, on any showing, is difficult if not dangerous.

Johnsonian Adventurism

President Johnson and his advisers seem to be unimpressed by the adverse economic outlook. On the contrary they plunge ahead toward November 1968 as though the only serious problem was the winning of the election. They have followed this course in the escalation of the Vietnam undeclared war. They are equally guilty of adventurism in their approach to economic problems.

Despite grave warnings from military elder statesmen like Generals MacArthur and Eisenhower, the President has allowed his administration to bog down the country in an Asian jungle war. Although he did not initiate the war or originate the foreign policy of which the Vietnam war is an integral part, he did take on the war when he assumed office. When confronted with a series of choices he decided to continue and expand the war instead of tapering it off and bringing it to a speedy end.

Anxious to occupy the center of the stage, President Johnson has been forced to choose between military adventurism and a moderate, middle-of-the-road course. Military adventurism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called for an aggressive United States response to the burgeoning nationalism and spreading socialism of Asia.

To make doubly sure of the outcome, President Johnson should have followed the same course that President Truman adopted in 1950, getting a United Nations' endorsement, and making the drive into southeast Asia a joint affair in which the "allies" included important world powers and operated under United Nations auspices.

Instead of following such a "safe" policy, the President jumped in with both feet, as in Santo Domingo, tossing wisdom and diplomatic niceties to the winds and crashing the gate with United States armed forces in search of a "victory" which has eluded him as a will-of-the-wisp lures and snares the unwary and foolhardy.

With a major election little more than a year away he has allowed the illusive military concept of "victory" to blind him to the difficulties and dangers of an economic and political situation that must be handled with talented diplomatic finesse if it is to avoid the open threat of developing into a general war fought by Washington and a few puny Asian satellites against the studied inertia of fellow imperialists, the hostility of the ex-colonial peoples, and the outspoken opposition of the socialist camp.

Following his present policy to its obvious conclusion President Johnson must either go it alone in an adventure that cannot possibly climax before November 1968 or he must lose face by withdrawing from the Vietnam struggle and confront the overwhelming probability of a political defeat at the polls in 1968. Experienced politicians know better than to allow themselves to get jammed into such a perilous position.

Much more than the issue of military victory or defeat in Vietnam is at stake in the present confrontation. Economically, politically, and culturally the United States is at a crossroads, facing critical choices; not the least of these choices is economic.

Three economic areas demand immediate attention from Washington. First, there is the possibility of a balanced stable economy, with inflation held to the minimum, an end to budget deficits and expanding debt. Second is the pressing question:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall an effort be made to stabilize the dollar as a world medium of exchange, or should a world bank issue a world currency and parallel the Universal Postal Union with a Universal Financial Union? The third economic problem is even more insistent. Shall a few rich interests and powers monopolize the planet's natural resources and raw materials, or shall the resource heritage of mankind be held in trust by a world economic authority paralleling the Universal Postal Union and the Universal Financial Union?

Politically, the key problem facing the Johnson Administration and mankind is this: Shall Washington, with its vast productive capacity, its great wealth, and its huge military apparatus attempt to inaugurate the American Century of world domination, or shall it press for an amended U.N. charter and for membership in a World Federation of Nations?

Culturally, the choice is even more consequential. Shall Washington proceed with its present policy of crushing socialism-communism and imposing the American Way of Life on mankind or shall it aim to be one among 125 or 130 sovereign nations, federated under a world authority, and accepting cultural coexistence as one of its basic principles?

Proceeding cautiously and wisely, President Johnson may extricate himself from the foreign policy strait jacket in which he presently finds himself. Rash decisions, provincial in outlook and reactionary in content, may easily lead him into a situation similar to that of Adolf Hitler in 1938 or even in 1945.

War on Women and Children

Many people living outside the United States are deeply concerned by the undeclared, illegal, atrocious war now being waged by the Johnson Administration and its armed forces against the people of Vietnam.

On January 1, 1967 the London *Observer* reprinted an eye-witness story which had appeared in *Le Monde* of Paris. The dispatch was written by Jacques Decornoy. The title of the article was "How North Vietnam Survives." Mr. Decornoy began describing Nam Dinh, third largest city of North Vietnam.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before February 1965 Nam Dinh had 90,000 inhabitants. "It looked," he said, "as though a typhoon had passed through it."

In the center of the town near the cathedral, a whole district, 240 houses, has been razed to the ground. What remained upright stands unsteadily among piles of rubbish yards high. . . . The skeletons of camouflaged trucks and engines remain from the raids. Also, in the working class district there are big newly-built blocks of low-rent flats which are today uninhabitable because they have been dangerously shaken by the bombs. In the center of the town a large nursery school, surrounded by craters, has been flattened by an explosion. The textile factory (Nam Dinh's textile tradition goes back to the last century) has been hit. . . .

At six o'clock in the evening Vietnam starts to move. It pedals, drags, digs, patches up, clears away, rebuilds. The way this people moves into action again every night is astonishing. . . . I saw the lines of lorries that leave the main towns at night. They are countless, in spite of the destruction of convoys. They carry everything: ammunition and weapons under tarpaulins covered with foliage; food; thousands of drums of petrol. . . . Burnt trucks, destroyed locomotives, twisted rails, smashed bridges—and yet things still move.

One week later, on January 8, *The Observer* ran another article: "Counting the Dead." The article, written from Washington by Raymond Heard, dealt with casualties in South Vietnam.

"At Christmas," Mr. Heard wrote, "12 Catholic, Protestant and Jewish clergymen told the President in a letter that 'the heartless war in Vietnam continues with the United States and South Vietnamese forces matching the terror and assassinations of the Vietcong by killing somewhere from two to five civilians for every Vietcong guerilla or North Vietnamese regular.' " If one accepts this ratio it would appear that between 320,000 and 800,000 civilians have been killed since the start of 1961. (This is arrived at by multiplying the Pentagon's body count of 160,000 Vietcong and regulars killed since 1961 by two and five.) The article continues:

Despite repeated requests from the Press and Congress, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pentagon can give no idea of the number of civilian casualties. The most conservative unofficial estimates, those of the *New York Times* and Associated Press—put the figure at a minimum of 1000 a month. The monthly journal of the New Left, *Ramparts,* devotes much of the January issue to an article on "The Children of Vietnam" in which Dr. Benjamin Spock and other war critics claim that "a million children have been killed, wounded or burned."

The Pentagon has figures showing that 20,400 civilians have been killed by the Vietcong since the start of 1962, and 4,303 "officials" since 1961. . . . Concern about civilian casualties caused by the U.S. and South Vietnamese forces is clearly mounting rapidly. . . . Asked last February why it was so difficult to get the facts, Mr. Rusk replied: "I just don't know. I have not myself seen any such figures."

Mr. Neil Sheehan, who was in Vietnam for the *New York Times* between 1962 and last summer, said in the newspaper's Sunday magazine recently that the military authorities had never seriously attempted to gather comprehensive statistics on civilian casualties. He said an indication of the figure was given in the fact that U.S. and other foreign medical teams working in three-quarters of the 43 provinces treated 2,000 civilian war-wounded each month.

Bombs, shells, napalm, and other destructives rained on populated centers cannot fail to cause civilian casualties. How many dead, wounded, and burned result from these atrocities seems to matter not at all to those responsible for them.

On June 26, 1967, the *New York Times* published a full page advertisement carrying "a message from 227,000 Danes to President Lyndon B. Johnson: STOP THE BOMBING." The signatures were collected between February 7 and April 7, 1967. This advertisement and sixty others inserted in Danish papers and periodicals were paid for by voluntary contributions from 488 professors, doctors, and other professions; 264 teachers; 55 clergymen; 210 trade union spokesmen; 112 workers; 340 architects; 92 business men; 321 public servants and office workers; 79 students; 387 actors and artists; 121 housewives; 53 members of Parliament and Town Councils.

Most of the signatures were collected by ringing doorbells. A Danish friend, who took part in getting the signatures, wrote

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us on May 28: "I don't know if it will do any good. It is a drop in the ocean. But better one drop than no drop. Among other things it has forced a lot of Danish people to think and talk about Vietnam."

A "stop the bombing" petition circulated in the United States would have to contain ten million signatures in order to represent the same proportion of the population as those who responded among Denmark's four and a half millions.

Acre for acre the region in which Vietnam currently forms the dramatic foreground is as rich as any land on the face of the earth.

—Charles J. V. Murphy, Fortune, December 1966

I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own.

—General David M. Shoup, retired commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, May 14, 1966

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

☐ 1 year $6 (foreign $7) 50s. ☐ 2 years $10 (foreign $12) 86s.

Special sub rate to students: $4 (foreign $5) 36s.

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

I enclose $.....

I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for ☐ one year
☐ two years

Name .....

Address .....

.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Partisans 37—Avril-Juin 1967

CUBA ET LE CASTRISME EN AMERIQUE LATINE

Saverio Tutino: L'acquis de la révolution
Ernest Mandel: Le grand débat économique
Ernesto "Che" Guevara: Sur la conception de la valeur
Roberto Fernández Retamar: Les intellectuels dans la révolution
Jesús Díaz: Pour une culture militante
Régis Debray: Le rôle de l'intellectuel
Christian Baudelot, Jean-Yves Pouilloux: Sur "Révolution dans la révolution?"
Fidel Castro: Avant la patrie, il y a l'humanité
J.-J. H.....: Stratégie de la lutte révolutionnaire
Jean-Claude Guénier: Luttes au Venezuela
Douglas Bravo: Le manifeste d'Iracara
Héctor Bejar: Bilan d'une guérilla
Rafael H. Gaviria, Calarcá Moeschamp: La lutte en Colombie
Albert-Paul Lentin: Des experts de Punta del Este aux "bérets verts" de Santa-Cruz
M. M.: La situation à Saint-Domingue
Bernard Couret: Le Vietnam, banc d'essai de la lutte anti-guérilla
Communiqués, Courrier

Rédaction - Administration:
1, place Paul-Painlevé, Paris (5).
Tél.: 633-41-16.

ce numéro 8,70 f.

Abonnement à *Partisans* (Numéros spéciaux périodiques)
1 an (6 numéros): France: 42 F.
1 an (6 numéros): Etranger: 47 F.
Virement au C.C.P. François Maspero, édit., 6.556-60 Paris.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

CULTURE OF POVERTY OR POVERTY OF CULTURE?

BY GORDON K. LEWIS

La Vida—A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty, San Juan and New York, by Oscar Lewis. Random House, New York, 1966; $10.00.

This is the latest installment of the tremendous series in the study of poverty in the Western hemispheric world which Oscar Lewis has made peculiarly his own. The methodology employed, that of multiple autobiographies with observed typical days to build up, in massive detail, the family portrait of selected people in the slums of San Juan and Puerto Rican Harlem, is not, of course, as novel as it is sometimes made to seem: much of it was used by Dolci in his studies of Sicilian poverty, while to some extent it consists, as Lewis himself admits, of the traditional devices of anthropological inquiry. That Lewis, at the same time, has exhaustively refined the method is beyond doubt. And what is equally important, he has not permitted the method to become his master. He brings to the scene wit, compassionate sympathy, a rare understanding of what makes people behave, so that he makes of his work a truly imaginative sociology. Anyone familiar with the arid quality of the work done hitherto by the American social scientists on Puerto Rico, essentially dehumanized by the coma of research,

---

Gordon Lewis, Professor in the College of Social Sciences at the University of Puerto Rico, is the author of MR Press book, *Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean,* and a forthcoming two-volume work on the British West Indies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will readily recognize the true measure of the sociological humanism of this volume. The remark with which the late Robert Redfield expressed his own fine disgust at the work, for example, of the Columbia University group, summed up in their *People of Puerto Rico*—"But where are the people?"—comes to mind. The distinction I seek to make here can be best understood by quoting another remark, that of Professor Alfred Zimmern, in once speaking about the administrative socialism of the Fabians: "The Webbs," he said, "are interested in town councils, Graham Wallas is interested in town councillors." So, while there is much in the Lewis volume that deals, quite properly, with the institutional environment, the real hero-figures of the social drama are the people of the San Juan slum-ghetto, not eccentric, perhaps, in an English sense but possessed, nevertheless, of a vibrant and intense personality all of their own.

In this richly observed tapestry, then, we watch the various members of the pseudonymous Rios family as they live out their daily lives, first in San Juan and then in New York. They inhabit a hostile world of "cops," welfare workers, urban Negroes and Italians, grasping employers (although there are occasional glimpses of humane Jewish employers). They are "pushed around" endlessly; so they hate bureaucracy, not least of all the exposure to the tyranny of rent which is involved in the transfer from the slum to the housing project. They live on their wits, although that does not preclude hard work, when they can get it, in the best spirit of the Protestant economic virtues. They have a real gift for tolerance, shaped ineluctably out of the struggle for social existence. They live, not avidly for money, but for the passionate intensity of the given moment. They are, many of them, brutalized, loud-speaking, gross inviduals, constituting, in fact, as one Puerto Rican critic has noted, a new breed of Puerto Ricans, the "neo-jet Puerto Ricans," far removed from the gentle folk-people of the traditional Puerto Rican literature. But it is not a depraved brutality, for it is ameliorated by the informal systems of mutual aid which the poor everywhere build up as defense-mechanisms against class society—although the lament of Soledad in the section "Nobody Loved Me" about the envy and the selfishness of her neighbors suggests that there might be some considerable mythology about that mutual aid as it is eroded by the murderous pressures of the life struggle. It is, above all, a nomadic life, with New York still playing the fantastic role of the New Jerusalem.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Much of the book deals, inevitably, with the grim disillusionment of that dream; to read the section entitled "I'd Rather Be in Puerto Rico" is to be made to feel the full sadness of the terrible homesickness that afflicts the Puerto Rican migrant like a real sickness. For the Puerto Rican exile, clearly enough, hates the American experience, not politically but socially. He detests the rush, the absence of tranquillity, the indecent treatment of the aged, the racial discrimination, the incapacity of Americans, despite their wealth, to enjoy themselves. It is the final indictment of American life that these Puerto Rican visitors, as Oscar Lewis describes them, leave the United States as soon as they can and with little affection for it. They prefer the purgatory of San Juan to the hell of New York.

Traditionally, as Lewis reminds us, the literature on the poor has seen them either, as in the Victorian eulogies of the "deserving poor," as acceptable candidates for graduation in the middle class school or as a depraved crowd, as is evident enough in that fear of the masses that infected the liberal creed, even in De Tocqueville and the younger Mill. It is the virtue of his own book that it condones neither view. It does not embrace, on the one hand, that sort of anthropological Rousseauism which so frequently mars even scholastic work on the life of contemporary peasantries; nor, on the other hand, does it see the world of the poor as a sordid and mean sub-culture that can only be rescued by the application of bourgeois virtues. The real picture, like all real life, is contradictory. On the one side, this is a harsh world of sub-classes which surely no one, had he the choice, would willingly elect to live in. Many of the Lewis character-types are, it is true, content to live in it. But many of them speak admiringly of middle-class values, of the "better things"; they spend money, even squander it, on furniture and clothes; when there are children and they live in settled fashion with some man, many of the women work hard at a job; there is even the figure of the "respectable prostitute" like Felicita who demands "respect" even from her men clients and who dreams of a new world of education and marriage for her children. Clearly enough, the tragedy of such individuals is that, exposed to the larger affluent society, they are doomed forever to aspire to values they can never fulfil because they, quite literally, possess no bargaining power in the acquisitive society. To romanticize their life-style would be the final insult; they would reply, if they could, that it is only the person who does

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not have to work for a living who talks glibly about the "dignity of labor."

On the other side, even so, these people are not the scum of the earth, except to those new Puerto Rican middle-class groups whose own morbid fear of relapsing back into their own earlier poverty explains their shrill, frenzied reaction to the publication of the Lewis book. Every people, as Burke insisted, must have some compensation for its slavery. No one can read the book without an enhanced respect for the positive aspects of the Rios family life-style. The love of parent, child, and friend shines through. There is an eagerness for new experience in the face of endless disillusionment, a feeling for human contact, a survival of shrewdness and intelligence despite the pressure of ignorance, the presence of health and sex and the capacity to enjoy them, that has not given way to helplessness and despair. Indeed, it is the irrepressible optimism that strikes the observer in all this. There is a keen aversion to suicide as a way out, as well as a proper Catholic horror of it. There is, all in all, a Rabelaisian quality in this social portrait, and there are whole sections of the book that would have delighted, for example, Chesterton. The sexual act itself—even within the withering framework of prostitution—becomes, as it were, a hymn of praise to the life-happiness principle, and not an occasion for solemn analysis or an instrument of "beatnik" revolt. For those Puerto Ricans whose Catholic puritanism has been offended by the "immorality" of the book, indeed, the answer is the fine assertion of Chesterton, recently quoted by a West Indian progressive paper in defense of Trinidadian Carnival, that "if by vulgarity we mean coarseness of speech, rowdiness of behavior, gossip, horseplay, and some heavy drinking, vulgarity there always was wherever there was joy, wherever there was faith in the gods." To regard the way in which the Rios family copes with its destiny, and then to compare it, say, to the portrait of the fictional East Indian family in Naipaul's novel, *A House for Mr. Biswas,* in which the members live a passive life, unable to stand by any original Oriental conviction, incapable of making out of their traditional Hindu faith an effective defense against cultural assimilation, and vulnerable, because of their colonialist credulousness, to the latest mental or social fad that they encounter in the *picaroon* Trinidadian society, is to begin to appreciate the truth that the ownership of wealth in itself does not necessarily equip a minority group with the power of positive reaction in its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general social role. The ghetto, all this is to say, has its positive as well as its negative features. It can be, as Kenneth Clark has recently pointed out in his remarkable analysis of Negro Harlem, a cocoon as much as a cage; for it gives its denizens an inner power to meet the massive contempt of the outer society, a contempt, in the Puerto Rican case, compounded by the contempt with which the language of the Puerto Rican migrant is treated by all other New Yorkers, including the other minority groups. From this viewpoint, then, slum clearance becomes an act of war against the minority group, for it robs the group of a vital emotional base. It is not for nothing that the lengthy Lewis book ends with an epilogue describing the incredible loneliness and boredom that descend upon a Rios family member as she seeks to settle down in a new housing project to which she has almost been forcibly removed by the Puerto Rican welfare agencies.

What are the theoretical implications of all this? Lewis seeks to state them within the framework of what he terms the "culture of poverty." As defined here, in his introduction, this means, among much else, a sub-culture of poverty-stricken people characterized by a "lack of effective participation in the major institutions of the larger society." Seen thus, it is not unlike the concept of the "pluralist society" which the West Indian anthropologist M.G. Smith has recently borrowed from Furnivall to apply to the polyethnic West Indian society; it would have been rewarding if Lewis had told us how he sees the "culture of poverty" in relation to this concept of pluralism. Looked at in their own terms, however, there is reason to suspect that there is some discrepancy between the theoretical statement and the accumulated evidence of the documentation itself. For, clearly enough, to begin with, the world the documentation describes is not a strong normative sub-culture defending a strongly felt set of values against the top culture, not to speak of being, as it were, a contra-culture that is in open conflict with the dominant system. There is little sense of social fatalism, as already noted. There is little enough, on Lewis's own showing, of strong psychological alienation. His people share in the Puerto Rican political value system. They even share in the American value system; one of the most moving episodes of the book describes how two of the Puerto Rican women factory workers in New York spent all they had to make a trip to Washington in order to pay their respects to the assassinated President Kennedy. In the vital field of religious belief, always among the first to carry

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signs of group revolt, there is again a general conservatism in which the slum poor, like most of working-class Puerto Rico, practice spiritualism and the cult of the popular saints. There is nothing here of the splendid shamanistic fervor of the Caribbean cult-religions, nor of the "back to Africa" ideology with which the Jamaican Rastafarian group express their conviction that, trapped in the Jamaica of the brown middle class, they are the victims of a new Babylonian Captivity from which they yearn to escape. Lewis notes the strength of the family in the Puerto Rican situation. As an anthropologist, he is entitled to his admiration for that testimony to institutional survival. But as a socialist he might sometimes wonder about the implications of the fact that throughout the history of socialist thought, from Plato through the radical aspects of the historical Jesus to Marx himself, there has been a radical skepticism of the family as a basically conservative force. Certainly, as one reads the lives of Lewis's people, Fernanda and Simplicio and Benedicto, it is clear enough that it is their deep attachment to the family tie, for all of its bitter quarrelling, that keeps them from open revolt against the system of which they are the unwitting prisoners.

If, then, the "culture of poverty" concept is conceived to consist of a virulent sub-culture socially transmitted, intact, generationally, the case seems not proven for this book. What Lewis here conceptualizes as a "culture of poverty" is not much more than a bastard spurious culture, a halfway house between the lost original culture of the Puerto Rican folk-people and the massive American industrial capitalism with which the Puerto Rican poor must learn, somehow or other, to come to terms. It is possible to document the rise of a growing class consciousness in the poor, as Thompson has done recently in his work on the British working class. It is open to doubt, however, whether there exists a culture of the poor, coherent, viable, separate, whose members possess a world-view fundamentally different from that of the larger society. To be sure, that there is a difference of quality is beyond doubt, as the literature from Dickens to Orwell shows. But it is not a quality of ideology. And I urge this not because the concept is difficult to fit into a socialist scheme but because the evidence to support it, in this book, seems at best inconclusive.

The evidence, as I read it, reveals a life of triangular loyalties—to class, race, and nation—with the loyalty to class constituting the weakest and that to nation (that is, to Puerto Rico) the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strongest links in the chain. The slum poor hate the rich. But the gulf that divides them, as they see it, is a preordained destiny; and rich and poor only meet each other amicably in fairy tales. Any kind of racial alliance with the American Negro is likewise precluded because the Puerto Rican, although Negro, shares the more benign Caribbean racial classificatory system and finds the American black-white color scheme offensive; and even when he is sympathetic to the civil-rights movement, he will frequently feel that it is a strictly "American" struggle in which he is not obliged to join. It is, rather, the sense of national identity, of being distinctively Puerto Rican, that marks off the *dramatis personae* of the book from the rest of the poor in America. They express themselves most fiercely when they speak of themselves, not as members of a social sub-class or as Negroes, but as Puerto Ricans. They resent the incapacity of Americans to see them as such. They feel—and frequently say so with some fine dignity—that there is a quality of life in Puerto Rico that American life, with its frenzied haste and vulgarized commercialism, lacks. That this feeling is based, much of it, on an obvious romanticization of realities does not belittle its importance as a positive element in their general value system. Above all, they fight against the general American contempt for their culture, and especially their language: "If I could be Governor of Puerto Rico or the Mayor of New York for five or ten minutes," one of them insists in a characteristic explosion, "I'd take a pistol and I'd shoot every Puerto Rican who has forgotten Spanish."

It is here, I suspect, that the Lewis interpretation goes awry. For the Puerto Rican, at this point, expresses something that has to do, not with his social, but with his colonial experience. At this point he does possess a strongly felt set of values. But they are values arising out of the one great wound that colonialism everywhere inflicts upon its victims, the ruthless destruction of the native cultures and the sense of shame and guilt engendered in the colonials by all the machinery of colonial rule, government, education, politics, religion. It is a process which, historically, both European socialism and American liberalism have connived at and frequently activated. It is not enough to refute Fanon, as does Lewis, by citing the absence of revolutionary spirit or radical ideology in the San Juan poor. Different peoples, even in the colonial world, work out their salvation by different avenues, and for the Puerto Ricans, as things now stand at least, it is the avenue of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural *revanche,* of the affirmation, frequently only half consciously understood even by themselves, of the sense of *puertorriquenidad.* The real cure for the cultural pathology he annotates, Lewis asserts, as in his brief remarks on Cuba, is socialism. But that is to imply that the key to an understanding of Puerto Rican poverty is that it is set within the framework of American capitalist society. So to argue is to overlook the colonial relationship. These people, in brief, are poor twice over: they are the poor in the American business-civilization, but they are also the poor in the American Caribbean colonialism. That the book tends to emphasize the first dimension and to underplay the second leads, I believe, to a fatal disproportion of emphasis which is not readily visible only because it is obscured by the author's own humanist sympathy with the victims of the general situation.

It is another way of putting all this to say that, when all is said and done, what Lewis has put together here is a study in a dying colonialism. He himself tends to see it, however, as the price the poor have to pay for the victory of industrial civilization, in much the same way as the great investigations of Mayhew, General Booth, and the Webbs collectively portrayed the price in the case of that victory in Victorian England. The Puerto Rican poor accept that price, he seems to argue, because of the values inherent in the "culture of poverty." As against that line of argument it is pertinent (1) that in fact they do not accept the price so passively in the particular area of a felt sense of separate national identity, as the book itself documents; and (2) that when they do accept it, it is not because of the power of certain forces inherent in the special concept that Lewis has made his own (forces, I think, that are never satisfactorily defined with any precision) but because of other forces, the ingrained docility that René Marques has described, for example, or the sense of collective inferiority complex which Ricardo Alegría has argued infects all Puerto Ricans in one way or another. Those other forces, moreover—and this is the crucial point—are the legacy of the Puerto Rican colonial experience. Even the very intensity with which the Puerto Rican asserts his *puertorriquenidad,* it could plausibly be argued, is itself an expression of the inferiority complex, for a social group that possesses real self-assurance is under no felt necessity to announce it publicly. That is why, perhaps, Americans praise themselves whereas the English merely permit others to praise them.

It is, then, the chief and disappointing defect of this quite

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarkable volume that, as a Catholic humanist critic has pointed out, it fails to fashion any really positive statement on the sins committed by the American social system against the colonial disinherited. It takes issue with those American academicians, like Tumin and Feldman in their blandly optimistic *Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico,* who lend their support to the official image merchants of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth Government; but it itself joins in the chorus of acclamation about "Operation Bootstrap," when in grim reality the evidence it unearths is a damning indictment of the heavy social cost (perhaps even heavier than Lewis suggests, if the recent findings of Puerto Rican social workers like Rosa Marin are to be believed) that many of the Puerto Rican people have had to pay for the alliance between Amrican corporate business and the Puerto Rican colonial political class. The very success itself of the Lewis book indicates, in a peculiar way, how the colonial system works, for colonialism everywhere denigrates the local product and magnifies the metropolitan, so that books by the metropolitan authors receive vast attention whereas books by native authors—in this particular case, the work, for example, of Puerto Rican social scientists like Eduardo Seda on the processes of brutalization and deculturation in insular life—are passed by unnoticed. The reader, then, who wants a more total portrayal of the situation would like to see something more said than is said in this book about the particular Puerto Rican components of the situation. There is, after all, something special about popular social life in the Caribbean, the *specificae differentiae* of tropical existence, that helps to explain how and why the poor live. In the particular Puerto Rican case many of the characteristics evidenced in the Lewis documentary—the good humor, the pride in manners, the demand for "respect," the readiness to work in the system, the mimic fighting which is not really destructive violence—are general traits which belong to most social groups as they flow, historically, from a common ancestry in the folk-tradition of the Puerto Rican people over the last two centuries. Nor are these just the idealized traits frequently to be met with in the Puerto Rican nationalist literature. They play a vital functional role as therapeutical defenses, as families like the extended Rios household learn the lessons of survival in the modern industrial state.

Lewis could argue, of course, that he has wanted the record to speak for itself. "My major obligation," he has said elsewhere,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"is to give voice for the first time to these poor people." So we see them here as real flesh and blood persons, not the dehumanized items of statistical sociology; they speak for themselves; they express their impulsive, eudaemonistic lives in ways that Père Labat, the irrepressible chronicler of Caribbean life in the 18th century, would immediately have recognized across the centuries. All this is admirable as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. For social experience, whatever its rich immediacy may be, requires ultimately some form of interpretative analysis. It requires, even more, a perception of the possibilities of change, of the possible avenues of escape from the present to the future, of what presently are available as the instrumentalities of change. The social pictorialist, that is to say, must become the social theoretician; but even more, quite frankly, he must seek to identify himself with those forces which, on the basis of the evidence he marshals, promise to lead the way out to a new and better world. (One thinks, by way of comparative example, of how the Hammonds, in their classic books on the life and mind of the English laboring classes between 1760 and 1832, interwove the detail of the record they described with their own awareness, based on their classical socialism, of how much of the pre-industrial community, for all of its own defects, had been needlessly destroyed by the victory of capitalist individualism.) Nor is it enough to believe that the mere publication of a book of social exposure (for although Lewis denies that his volume is such exposure, that, in effect, is what it really amounts to) meets the issue. For books do not overturn social orders; a priest who has worked with the San Juan poor has recently reminded the readers of the Lewis book that when the earlier volume, Wenzell Brown's *Dynamite on Our Doorstep,* was published, the fear that it would destroy the "prestige" of the island was stillborn. All in all, Oscar Lewis has laid bare the sickness of Puerto Rican society. But he has done little to write a prescription of cure.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

END OF AN EPOCH IN THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

BY PHILIP RENO

The West on Trial, My Fight for Guyana's Freedom by Cheddi Jagan. International Publishers, New York, 1967; $10.00.

The ouster of Cheddi Jagan's government in British Guiana ended an epoch in the struggles by colonial peoples for liberation. After Cheddi's ouster, independence was granted to Guyana—confirming that the neo-colonial structure of power in former colonies had reached Guyana, and that new forms of struggle were required for liberation.

The epoch had begun, as the Second World War was ending, in world-wide demands for a broader basis of privilege than the colonial system could provide. The victors in the war had pledged a world order based politically on accommodation of the United States and USSR, and conceptually on the Four Freedoms of the Atlantic Charter. With a few notable exceptions the struggles for national liberation accepted these concepts as the goals of political action, and demanded fulfillment of the promises they implied. The epoch ended in betrayal of the promises, and in bankruptcy of the concepts as guides to action for social change.

By 1965 when the Jagan government was ousted, all but a few of the governments swept into office by liberation movements had been corrupted, subverted, or overthrown. United States domination had replaced that of the former colonial powers. The administrative apparatus of colonial governments had been transferred from foreign bureaucrats to native elites. The colonial bourgeoisie had, with independence, exchanged their alliances with the peasantry and the working class for political and financial ties with great industrial powers, both capitalist and socialist. By the end of the epoch the character of struggles for liberation had fundamentally changed.

This epoch in a critical sector of the liberation struggle, and

---

Philip Reno, a long-time student of Guyanese affairs, is the author of MR Press book *The Ordeal of British Guiana* (1964).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the issues that gave it life, are the primary subject of Cheddi Jagan's book, *The West on Trial, My Fight for Guyana's Freedom.**

Three features of the Guyanese experience are singularly meaningful for the changes taking place in struggles for national liberation. These features, reported in detail in Cheddi's book, are:

(1) *The Incorporation of Guyana in the American System.* The change from British to United States control and the character of United States intervention in Guyanese affairs are spelled out in Cheddi's book. Revealing facts have, however, come to light since the book was written, and have appeared in accounts of CIA activities carried by various magazines. Of particular interest for Guyana is a report in the *New Republic* of March 4 concerning a British document about CIA activities. This report notes the conduct and administration by CIA agents of bombings, murders, and a general campaign of terror against the Jagan government. An American labor union official who spoke for "free labor" and the "free world"—and who was paid by the CIA—was reported to have recruited Guyanese for these activities and trained them in bomb fabrication and bombing tactics.

There are two critical points about CIA-directed violence and terror in Guyana. The first is that violence and terror have not been exceptional but have been the essence of United States policy in Guyana. While Jagan was in office, candidates opposing his election promised, after a trip to the United States, that if Jagan were defeated "American aid would flow like Niagara" into Guyana. These candidates are now in office, but a few million dollars has been the extent of American aid. This is far less than the damage caused by riots, fires, and strikes instigated by American agents, and probably even less than was spent by the CIA in the organization of this damage. Moreover, much of the little economic aid that the United States has given seems to have supported still other clandestine and lawless American activities. Let me illustrate with a story which may well be apocryphal.

On one of my first evenings in Guyana in 1963, I stopped in a Georgetown bar and fell into conversation with a man who turned out to be a key AID official. We talked on for some time

*The title does not, in my opinion, properly represent the book nor do justice to its point of view. There is no real issue about the West (imperialism), being on trial; its guilt is beyond any shadow of a doubt, and deepens day by day. The issue is simply how to bring its crimes to an end. The title may of course be the publisher's rather than Cheddi's own.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the impact of Western technology on the lives of people in remote places where one or the other of us (mostly the AID man) had been. Coming at last to the Far East I mentioned the Trans-Siberian railway. "Trains don't go through now," the AID man said. "Forty miles have been wiped out." To answer my skepticism he went on: "I ought to know. I blew it up myself."

Terror and violence give substance to the United States government strand in the rope of American domination. Cheddi recounts various instances of the relationship with American corporations which forms the other strand. The government of Forbes Burnham, which replaced the Jagan government, is reported to have allotted great areas of bauxite land to Reynolds Aluminum for a reported 75 years, and to have frozen income tax rates and royalties for the first 25 of these years. Concessions have also tied up the country's oil and other mineral rights. These concessions, coupled with regressive tax legislation and related government policies, sentence the country to continued underdevelopment.

The second point about United States foreign affairs is that violence and corruption are the American trade mark not only in Guyana, but throughout the world. Even Americans are no longer blind to the evil blight spreading with American interventions—the foreign cities turned into American brothels, the black markets, and generally the wanton turpitude that infest the areas where American troops and businessmen are found, the payoffs rewarding political and economic concessions—and, through these practices, the creation of gangster castes in control of local governments. No place in the Western Hemisphere has yet reached the degradation of South Korea or South Vietnam, or of the Philippines or Liberia. Insolence, corruption, and naked force have, however, long been the norms of American "Banana Republic" operations, and these norms are now taking on the momentum of the United States drive to world rule—or ruin.

The meaning of United States foreign policy for struggles for national liberation and social justice is simply that the United States will not tolerate either one. Those who carry on struggles for a better life not only face a rapacious caste of local oppressors armed and engined by the United States, and living up their brief moment of absolute power; people's struggles face as well armed American intervention wherever necessary to maintain this caste in power.

(2) *The Neo-Colonial Bourgeoisie*: *Ally or Class Enemy?* A

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basic issue being argued by radicals in Latin America, and quite probably throughout emerging countries, relates to the role of the entrepreneurial bourgeoisie and the bureaucratic caste in these countries. The issue is whether the interests of the native elite and businessmen conflict materially with imperialist domination, and whether this conflict makes these castes potential allies of the masses of the poor in anti-imperialist struggles. During colonial struggles for independence such alliances were effective and, the argument goes, similar alliances can still mobilize national struggles against imperialist exploitation.

In British Guiana, as in many colonial countries, young men sent to industrial countries to study returned home to lead struggles for independence, and often for socialism. When Cheddi and Janet Jagan returned from the United States in 1943, they began to rally Guyanese trade unions, peasants, masses of the poor, and also a good many younger professionals stung by British racist and repressive practices. Within ten years the movement had gathered majority support, and had won the first general election in the country's history. The next dozen years were taken up by British and American efforts to split the movement and splinter its support.

In larger colonies, liberation movements had fallen apart when imperialist power granted privileges of local government and opportunities for business profits to native entrepreneurs, professionals, and politicians. In British Guiana and other small colonies the native elite included only a few businessmen (mainly shopkeepers, moneylenders, and the like), being primarily composed of government employees and professionals (lawyers, doctors, bookkeepers, accountants, etc.).

Almost none of the holders of the few positions of "honor and profit" joined the Guyanese movement for independence, but a number joined from the lower ranks of government and the margins of professional and business elites. As in practically every emerging country, such more articulate and aggressive members of the middle class took leading roles in the independence movement. These frustrated members of the native bourgeoisie played a critical role in the epoch of liberation struggles that ended with the granting of independence to the colonies. The question is whether they will play a similar role in the epoch of "independence"—in other words, of United States dominance.

The essence of the "neo-colonial" situation is, it seems to me,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the absorption into the United States imperialist system of those native elites which have been given power. The governments of about a dozen colonies maintained ties with the working class and poor, or threatened to do so. With few exceptions, these governments have been replaced by governments fitting United States requirements. China and Cuba and possibly Algeria have accomplished social revolutions out of reach of re-assertion of bourgeois dominance. Two African sub-Saharan countries still tread the thin edge between bourgeois and revolutionary control. The other exceptions to United States dominance are the Arab countries, where governments representing the dominant bourgeoisie have been armed and aided economically by the USSR. Russian terms have apparently been far more acceptable than the harsh terms of dominance insisted on by the United States. Whatever international purposes these arms and armies may or may not serve, they certainly serve to suppress the Arab poor.

With political independence won, the struggles of the masses of the poor in neo-colonial countries must inevitably, it seems to me, take form in demands for social justice. Is it not pure fantasy to expect that in such struggles the interests of the poor and exploited will join with the interests of the native exploiters against the foreign imperialists? In Guyana and in most neo-colonies the governments and the strata they represent have in fact become part of the imperialist system, and have lined up with the world metropolitan centers against the poor of each country and of the world.

(3) *The Peoples Progressive Party.* The most significant difference between the struggles in Guyana and those in other emerging countries may well have been in the organization that carried on the struggles—the Peoples Progressive Party. Cheddi points out in his book that party organization has been Janet's main endeavor, and the party's internal democracy and the common people's participation in it reflect her concern. For the importance of this concern, contrast the present strength of people's forces in Guyana with the weakness in countries like Ghana, where the country's leaders were similarly oriented but were alienated from the masses of the poor.

Because of the democratic structure of the PPP, the middle class defections provoked by the United States and Britain caused the party little damage. Because of its program of struggle, involving people in mass campaigns, the American terror, intimida-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, and corruption made few inroads on the party's mass support. In the election of 1964, after which the PPP was ousted from the government, the party actually gained in its percentage of the popular vote, and would have won had the United States and Britain permitted Guyana the "first past the post" election system, which is followed in both these countries and indeed in most election systems of the world. The party will almost surely win the next honest election, if such an election is ever again permitted.

The democratic form and even the socialist outlook of the Peoples Progressive Party do not guarantee, however, that the party is adequate for the struggles that lie ahead. As far as I could tell, there is no Marxist-Leninist party in Guyana, and some radicals do not believe that any other kind of party can guide the way to socialism. This question is pressing because of the gathering momentum of the American juggernaut. How can a party oriented to parliamentary struggle cope with a world closing in toward war, a world in which socialist victories at the polls face armed imperialist intervention?

How the PPP sees the new world situation I do not know. Guyana would be a most difficult terrain for guerrilla tactics, and the Guyanese people have little alternative to "Western" democratic processes. United States activities increasingly render such processes futile, however, and bordering Guyana to the South and West is a continent where the ghost of Che Guevara, or Che himself it hopefully appears, is beating on the door.

Cheddi Jagan's book actually spends little time discussing issues such as those singled out above. Rather, it tells the story of struggles upon which each reader can base his own conclusions, and it tells this story well. The book should have a considerable impact on the emerging world, for the Guyanese struggles have won widespread sympathy. These struggles express, after all, a classic confrontation in every folk culture in the world—the warm-hearted people of a small, weak country arrayed against the armed might and opulence of the world's most arrogant nation. Cheddi is nevertheless confident that time and history are on the side of the Guyanese people, and the reasons for his confidence come through in his record of the struggles they have carried on, and which they continue to carry on.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS IN PRINT

		List Price	Price With Sub*
ECONOMICS			
The Political Economy Of Growth—Baran		$ 5.00	$ 9.00
Monopoly Capital—Baran and Sweezy		8.75	13.00
Capitalism Yesterday And Today—Dobb	paper	1.00	7.00
The Accumulation Of Capital—Luxemburg	cloth	7.50	11.00
The Present As History—Sweezy	paper	2.95	7.50
The Theory Of Capitalist Development—Sweezy		6.00	10.00
Paul A. Baran: A Collective Portrait— Sweezy and Huberman, eds.		3.50	8.00
PHILOSOPHY			
Marxism And Moral Concepts—Ash		3.50	8.00
Pride Of State—Morray		4.00	8.50
The Alienation Of Modern Man—Pappenheim	paper	2.45	7.50
A Philosophy Of Man—Schaff		3.25	8.00
SOCIOLOGY			
Mau Mau From Within—Barnett and Njama		10.00	14.00
In Place Of Fear—Bevan		4.50	9.00
Merrie England—Blatchford		5.00	9.00
Capitalism As A System—Cox		6.50	10.50
Caste, Class, And Race—Cox		7.50	11.00
A New World In The Making—Dolci		7.50	11.00
Waste—Dolci		6.75	10.50
Studies In A Dying Colonialism—Fanon		4.95	9.00
MARXISM			
Nationalism And Socialism—Davis		7.50	11.00
The Materialistic Conception Of History—Labriola		5.00	9.00
Marxism Of Our Time—Martinet		3.25	8.00
The Communist Manifesto—Marx and Engels		2.50	7.50
Parliamentary Socialism—Miliband	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1964 Miliband and Saville, eds.	cloth	6.00	10.00
The Socialist Register, 1965	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1966	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1967	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
Three Tactics: The Background In Marx—Moore		2.25	7.00
HISTORY			
The Menace Of The Miracle—Abosch		5.00	9.00
The Pen And The Sword—Foot		10.00	14.00
The Labor Spy Racket—Huberman		5.00	9.00
Man's Worldly Goods—Huberman	paper	2.95	7.50
We, The People—Huberman		5.00	9.00
From Yalta To Disarmament—Morray		8.50	12.00
Revolution In Seattle—O'Connor		5.00	9.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		List Price	Price With Sub*
CURRENT AFFAIRS			
The American Revolution—Boggs	paper	1.00	7.00
Lands Alive—Dumont		6.75	10.50
Burning Conscience—Eatherly and Anders		4.00	8.50
Ghana: End Of An Illusion— Fitch and Oppenheimer	cloth	3.50	8.00
	paper	1.50	7.00
Guerrilla Warfare—Guevara		3.50	8.00
Consciencism—Nkrumah		3.50	8.00
The Empire Of Oil—O'Connor		5.00	9.00
World Crisis In Oil—O'Connor	cloth	7.50	11.00
	paper	3.95	8.50
War Crimes In Vietnam—Russell	cloth	4.00	8.50
	paper	.95	7.00
LATIN AMERICA			
Explosion Over Latin America (The Man At The Door With The Gun)—Belfrage	cloth	4.50	9.00
	paper	2.75	7.50
Revolution In The Revolution?—Debray	cloth	4.00	8.50
	paper	1.50	7.00
Capitalism And Underdevelopment In Latin America—Frank		7.50	11.00
Dollar Diplomacy—Freeman and Nearing		6.50	10.50
Whither Latin America?— Fuentes and others	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.75	7.00
Puerto Rico: Freedom And Power In The Caribbean—Lewis		10.00	14.00
The Ordeal Of British Guiana—Reno	cloth	3.25	8.00
	paper	1.00	7.00
CUBA			
Inside The Cuban Revolution—Gilly	paper	2.50	7.50
Cuba: Anatomy Of A Revolution— Huberman and Sweezy	paper	1.75	7.00
The Second Revolution In Cuba—Morray		3.25	8.00
The United States, Cuba, And Castro—Williams		3.25	8.00
CHINA			
China Triumphs—Alvarez del Vayo		5.00	9.00
The Timely Rain: Travels In New Tibet—Gelder		8.95	13.00
Fanshen—William Hinton		12.50	16.00
Notes From China—Robinson	paper	.75	6.75
The Great Road—Smedley		6.75	10.50
FICTION, POETRY, CRITICISM			
Report To The Stockholders—Beecher		3.00	7.50
Review I—edited by Frances Kelly	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.00	7.00
The Road To Spain—Ira Morris		4.95	9.00
News From Nowhere—William Morris		5.00	9.00

(*All foreign subs, add $1 to price quoted. Prices in pounds sterling can be obtained from our London office.)

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Reprints in the MR PRESS Series

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Many Marxist scholars consider this book, first published in 1907, to be one of the two most important theoretical works on Marxism ever written by an American. (The other is **The Theory Of Capitalist Development** by Paul M. Sweezy). Certainly Boudin's work was the most important American contribution to the Revisionist controversy in the socialist movement touched off by Eduard Bernstein. An outline of the Marxian system of thought with the accent on the **system**, that is the relation of its different parts to each other and the unity of the whole, the book is an indispensable handbook for students of Karl Marx. Topics dealt with include the materialistic conception of history, value and surplus value, the labor theory of value, the concentration of capital, the proletariat and the revolution.

Price on publication November 30:	**$7.50**	**54s.**
Prepublication price:	**$6.00**	**42s.**
Associates price:	**$3.75**	**27s.**

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Classics of Radical Thought

History of the Commune of 1871

By (PROSPER OLIVIER) LISSAGARAY

This classic account of the Paris Commune, written by a soldier of the Commune, was first published in English in 1886. Translated from the French and with an introduction by Eleanor Marx Aveling, the English manuscript was revised and corrected by the translator's father, Karl Marx. Re-publication once more makes available the book Mrs. Aveling described as "the only authentic and reliable history of the Commune."

●

Price on publication November 30:	**$12.50**	**90s.**
Prepublication price:	**$ 9.00**	**64s.**
Associates price:	**$ 6.25**	**45s.**

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

The perfect gift for Christmas. Order now and save.

●

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An important contribution to historical literature from MR PRESS

The Decline of Socialism in America: 1912-1925

By JAMES WEINSTEIN

Mr. Weinstein has brought together in one volume an account of all radical organizations during the heyday of American socialism, and has discovered that far from declining after 1912 as has been generally assumed, the movement continued to hold broad appeal for masses of Americans for at least a decade thereafter. He also concludes in this exhaustively researched and carefully documented volume that the more recent failure of American socialism was at least as much due to internal troubles as to external barriers. The old Socialist Party, he points out in support of this thesis, had mass support at the polls, a powerful and widely read press, a large trade-union following, and had overcome obstacles of immigrant *vs.* "old stock," general prosperity, and Bull Moose competition.

James Weinstein has uncovered information that significantly alters the standard account of the socialist movement in the United States.—Prof. William Appleman Williams

Price on publication November 22:	$10.00	72s.
Prepublication price:	$ 7.50	54s.
Associates price:	$ 5.00	36s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

also recommended since despite its orientation, it includes interesting data and raises valid questions concerning economic and social inequalities in Latin America . . ." Sales of the book since publication in March 1967 (list price, $7.50) show that librarians are following the advice of the *Journal* to include the Frank work in their "Latin American collections."

Because *Nationalism and Socialism* by Horace Davis was published during the summer, on July 26, it may have escaped the attention of some readers. The article by Davis on p. 14 of this issue, containing the little known information that Marx and Engels were, in their early years, not opposed to imperialist expansion, shows the importance of this work—particularly today when an understanding of the subject of nationalism is so vital for comprehension of world affairs. The list price of the book is $7.50, but members of the Associates can get it at half-price, only $3.75. A clear example of the advisability of your heeding the plea contained in the Associates Appeal letter sent you on September 7: join the growing number of MR subscribers (one-fourth of the total number!) who are wise enough to help themselves and radical enough to help MONTHLY REVIEW by joining the Associates.

We have just received a batch of English reviews of recent MR Press books. Of *Fanshen* by William Hinton, The London *Times Educational Supplement* of April 21st says: "Mr. Hinton is concerned with the other revolution, away from the towns—land reform, the building of a more healthy society, the judgment of landlords by peasants who had been ill-treated for centuries. He mingled with peasants in a northern community and took down their accounts of the growth of organized revolt against landlords who rack-rented and mercenary soldiers who raped. Never before in English has the suffering of the poor in China been so completely described. . . . His book deserves to be widely read and discussed: it is unequivocal and controversial." And of *Dollar Diplomacy* by Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman, the *Book Exchange* of London says: "Although written more than forty years ago, the book continues to be valuable for the light it throws on the early origins of an American policy which has been greatly accelerated and vastly expanded in recent years."

The third annual Socialist Scholars Conference will be held at the New York Hilton on September 9-10. The sponsors anticipate that attendance this year will exceed last year's surprisingly large turnout of 2,000. We will be present and we urge MR readers to come, too.

From time to time we receive a bequest from a reader who felt, in his lifetime, that financial support would help make possible the continuance of MR as a completely independent magazine. Any reader who may be moved to follow this example should be careful to state exactly, in his will, that the bequest is to: "Monthly Review, Inc., of 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011."

Now is the time for you to

1) Save money

2) Help MR

by joining the Associates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution with the publication of

Through the Russian Revolution

by Albert Rhys Williams

with an introduction by Joshua Kunitz

Two great eyewitness accounts of the Russian Revolution were written by Americans—both of them colorful, detailed, authoritative—but through a quirk of personal fame only John Reed's was kept more or less continuously in print. Now the highly dramatic volume which has been called "*the* book of the Russian Revolution" is again available in this handsome facsimile of the lavish 1921 edition: 464 pages with rare photographs, color posters, revolutionary proclamations and a new biography of the author by Joshua Kunitz.

It is and will remain for all time the first book in the English language to which every writer about the Russian Revolution will turn.—Upton Sinclair.

It sets the blood tingling and keeps the eye fastened to the printed page till the end of the book is reached.—New York Tribune.

Price on publication November 7:	$12.50	90s.
Prepublication price:	$ 9.00	64s.
Associates price:	$ 6.25	44s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

The perfect gift for Christmas. Order now and save

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED